

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 2.—APRIL—1920.

I.

RELIGION AND THEOLOGY AFTER THE WAR.

A. S. WEBER.

It is a commonplace that nothing has been left quite undisturbed or unchanged by the World War. Its volcanic upheavals have overthrown empires and dynasties, wrought unparalleled devastation on land and sea, brought about world-wide commercial and industrial confusion, and entailed upon millions of hearts and homes unspeakable anxiety and distress, lifelong sufferings and sorrows.

The outburst of joy following the laying down of arms eighteen months ago was universal among the nations. The conquered no less than the victorious had become war-weary if not exhausted, and with previously unheard-of rejoicings they united in welcoming the day which promised them peace once more. Disillusionment, however, followed speedily, and by its rude shock awakened them to the fact that now as of old men may cry "Peace, peace!" when really there is no peace. Overseas the guns were silenced, but everywhere the nations were threatened by a possibly more disastrous form of warfare than that which had just ended. The age-old passions of hatred and revenge, of national prejudices and racial antagonisms, of selfish ambition and partisan intrigue, at once

revived, and following in their train there arose in all lands a social unrest which seriously menaces governmental law and order throughout the civilized world.

A knowledge of history and of human psychology should have led men in larger numbers to anticipate such a reversion to former type. Among the more thoughtful this was indeed done. They pointed out in advance that although the old-time ideals of individuals, of society and of nations were discredited, they were not destroyed. They warned us that although materialistic and scientific progress, educational achievements, unsupported by moral and spiritual convictions, had been proven untrustworthy, they were still alive. They reminded us that although in principle and power democracy had shown itself to overwhelming advantage over autocracy, it would have to be given a finer spirit and a nobler life before it could adequately meet the world's political needs. And, they declared that although men for the moment apparently acknowledged the value of religion and seemingly showed a deeper interest in theological questions, much would have to be done to establish this value and to sustain this interest. The value of religion would have to be proclaimed with new, convinced and convincing emphasis by the Christian pulpit, and demonstrated by those who profess and call themselves Christians in higher personal character and a juster social order. The interest in theology would have to be furnished with answers to its questions, in terms vital with the practical needs of today and in language that is understandable, rather than in the terms of traditional creedal statements or those of the outgrown systems of thought, abounding in unintelligible, not to say, irrational metaphysics, which thinkers of other centuries have handed down to ours.

The offices of religion and theology are, with reference to both the individual and organized society, the prime essentials to be insisted on in the undertaking and the prosecution of the needed reconstructive work which is now challenging attention. Happily, this is just now more clearly realized and

more generally acknowledged, than ever before. What the Apostles of old and their successors in the Gospel ministry ever since have been proclaiming, seems now to have come home to statesmen's hearts with persuasive and compelling authority: "There is none other name under heaven, given among men whereby we can be saved,"—saved, that used to mean, as individuals, but, as now seen, it applies to ordered society and to national life, just as well. Former President Taft and Colonel House, among others, have been preaching this Gospel, according to reports of their addresses in the public prints, and insisting upon the necessity of Christianizing national and international relations. The Prime Ministers of the British Empire—Lloyd George of England, Borden of Canada, Hughes of Australia, Botha of South Africa, Squires of Newfoundland, and Murray of New Zealand—have been engaged in the same gratifying enterprise. Over their joint signatory they say to those in whose service they are ministering: "The spirit of good-will among men rests on spiritual forces, the hope of a 'brotherhood of humanity' reposes on the deeper spiritual fact of the 'Fatherhood of God.' In the recognition of the fact of that Fatherhood and of the Divine purpose for the world, which are central to the message of Christianity, we shall discover the ultimate foundation for the reconstruction of an ordered and harmonious life for all men. We would therefore commend to our fellow citizens the necessity that men of good-will, who are everywhere reviewing their personal responsibility in relation to the reconstruction of civilization, should consider also the eternal validity and truth of those spiritual forces which are in fact the one hope for a permanent foundation for world peace." These notable utterances only affirm what the New Testament teaches, namely, that the only hope of the world's salvation resides in Jesus Christ—in the full-hearted acceptance and the faithful practice by men of the reasonable and authoritative principles and precepts of the Gospel, for their guidance in every plan and policy, every purpose and pursuit of life.

To churchmen, such an advocacy of the Evangel of Christ by statesmen at home and abroad, may in these troubled times bring added comfort and reassurance, but it need not cause them surprise. The old ideals of men and of nations have not stood the test of a World War. Their self-complacent reliance upon outward material prosperity, upon commercial expansion, and upon Godless scientific and intellectual achievements, has been hard hit. Men have been driven by the ruthless experiences of war to face life's problems in a new mental attitude. They have gotten a deepened insight regarding spiritual realities. They live in a sobered disillusioned mood. With these acquisitions on the part of many, multitudes of others, one might suppose, should be ready everywhere to welcome and to embrace Jesus Christ as the supreme revelation of God's will and character, and as the final authoritative Word concerning human righteousness and duty. Why is it that such is not the case?

A partial if not complete answer to this question can be found in the reluctance of unregenerate human nature to sacrifice its own ambitions, to surrender its own will. Even in the presence of Truth, it is unwilling to say, "Thy bondsman let me live." Like those whom Jesus rebuked, men may still cry "Lord, Lord," and at the same time refuse to heed what is divinely commanded. And to make matters worse, if possible, the spirit of our age, which is not merely disinclined to recognize any authority whatever, but is dead-set against it, fosters and applauds this perversity. Respect for law-making bodies—municipal, state and national—has vastly declined, deference to parents and teachers in homes and schools has greatly suffered, reverence for official leadership in the Church, even in that part of it which is most insistent in demanding it, has lost much ground—all of which is only more or less of a reflection of the self-willed spirit that defies God Himself. Instead of tiring of "unchartered freedom" or feeling "the weight of chance desires," such men glory in their supposed independence and imagined self-sufficiency,

and decline to acknowledge the binding authority of Him who is the Way the Truth and the Life of men. For men in this attitude the "New Commandment" to love one another can carry but little weight for private conduct and much less, of course, for the public control of social, national or international affairs.

Whatever the cause or causes of the present-day ineffectiveness of Christianity's appeal and authority, the leaders of religious thought may well inquire whether or not responsibility for the situation attaches to the Church itself and its theology, and if there does, what remedial measures should be employed to change it. What the medical diagnostician does when called to prescribe for a sufferer's restoration to health and strength, that we should do for the rehabilitation of the Christian Church. The root-sources from which the weaknesses of the Church and of theology have come to afflict us, must be ascertained before the needed remedies can be successfully applied. So far as the infirmities of the Church are concerned, we may be confidently assured, their sources lie within, not without in the ideals of its Gospel. In the time of the Reformation, one form of religious authority, hoary with age, was repudiated by a considerable number of Christians, who forthwith set up another authority in its stead. The latter's claims, like those of the "Man on the Tiber," have in the course of time and in the progress of historical and biblical knowledge suffered a similar fate. The theory of an inerrant Bible, as well as that of an infallible Pope, has lost commanding authority in the minds of constantly increasing numbers of people. Moreover, by insisting upon things belonging to the periphery rather than to the center of the Gospel, Protestantism from the start began dividing itself into competing, often antagonistic groups, thus sacrificing the strength which attends united effort and enfeebling the regard for voices that were so much at variance. Meanwhile the theology of these respective groups was speedily formulated into confessional standards, which, whatever the value they

once may have been supposed to represent, are now wielding no commanding influence outside constantly narrowing circles. The embittered discussions over metaphysical distinctions in effort to set forth the nature of the Savior's unique Personality, whether in the interest of honoring Him or for the branding of dissentients as heretical, have long since been regarded as having as little religious significance as the question about the procession of the Spirit from the Father alone or from the Father and the Son. And the once hotly debated questions concerning the validity of different forms of Baptism, the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament, and the necessity of an unbroken tactual succession for valid ministerial orders—these likewise have long been hindrances to the successful appeal of the Church to the mind of those outside its border. Interest in them has slipped away from the modern mind, and do what it will, the Church will never be able to revive interest in them.

Without here waiting to point out other weaknesses of the Church and traditional theology, which awhile later will be given consideration, the first requirement to be met in this new day, it seems to me, is the reinterpretation of Jesus and His Gospel with particular reference to the circumstances and the special needs of our times. In undertaking this, the thought of the Church will stress the fact that far more importance attaches to Christ's claims to speak the truth with Divine authority—a fact vindicated in His own experience and in the experience of His faithful followers—than to the subtlest speculations about the inscrutable mystery of His conception by the Holy Ghost or His Birth of the Virgin Mary. There is self-authenticating power in His revelation of the character and will of the Father. The validity of His authority to guide and to command can be tested now, as it has been generation after generation, down the ages by His devout and consecrated followers. And the thought of the Church will emphasize also, this fact, namely, that the Gospel, whilst centering in Jesus, is a gift, a piece of good-news, to sinful

men for their personal deliverance from sin and eternal salvation, it is at the same time in its deeper and more comprehensive implicates, a message of practical import and significance for the social and industrial, the commercial and political life of organized humanity. And for the recovery and support of faith in the authoritative Word of Jesus and the due enforcement of its far-reaching practical implicates, theology has grave responsibilities to meet and important services to render, not only to the Church but also to the solution of the perplexing problems with which civil governments are now dealing.

Indeed, is it not perfectly clear, that in an age like ours, with its growing educational advantages and its accompanying demands for rationality as the basis of its beliefs and their application to the complex problems of life, no form of religion, and least of all that of Christianity, can live and wield a commanding and sustaining authority, without an adequate theology. A theology, which follows not "the gleam" of changing metaphysical philosophies, but the "Light of the World" as its guide and authority, is in my judgment, indispensably necessary for the reconstruction of the Church and also for the healing of the many disorders from which the state is suffering.

One is well aware that in putting forth this contention, it is not a popular note that is struck. What is needed just now, one is not unlikely to be reminded, is real religion, not theology. To take an active part in the coöperative efforts made by the churches for human betterment, to promote the interests of reunion throughout Christendom, theological considerations may well be blinked with both eyes and forgotten. Joint activity in the performance of religious tasks, enthusiastic effort to "carry over the top" carefully planned schemes, generosity in providing funds for the support of every well-intentioned movement, and keeping step with the multitudinous suggestions of Christian agencies—those singly and together, it is supposed by many, have a far larger con-

tribution to make to the successful accomplishment of the purposes of the Gospel, than the so-called academic lucubrations of the theologian!

Let us not allow ourselves to be misled by such mistaken suppositions. Upon such combustible material the fatal optimism of the last half-century was built. To save itself from a like peril our day must build upon securer moral and intellectual foundations. It must undergird its religious structure by soundly reasoned thought—thought which accepts the guidance and the authority of Son of God and His Word, and so commend itself to the intelligence and conscience of men as rationally trustworthy. Religion will not be able to bear the stress and storm of life unless founded on the rock-bottom of eternal truth. However sincere and full of promise, a religion without an adequately supporting theology may for the time being appear, it always evaporates, as history has repeatedly shown, into an emotionalism which leaves the Church less effective and the world more disjointed and confused, than before. A religion without an authoritative and reliable theological basis, is always nebulous, and sooner or later—trails off in vapors that ascend and accomplish nothing. "A temperamental and romantic religion," one of the foremost thinkers of our times says in a recent book, "is doomed to a wide area, a weak effect and a brief life. It revolves in a subjectivism which is the final ruin of real religion because it is the destruction of the divine authority which alone can successfully appeal to human reason and permanently satisfy human conscience." Hence theological indifference, in the mind of a man or of a Church, should be looked upon as a sure symptom of a fatal disease, to whose prevalence in Protestant communions not a few of its lamentable weaknesses are directly or indirectly traceable, as well as the creation of reactions which in not a few instances have been strong enough to carry men back into the Pre-Reformation bondage of the Roman Church. And so long as this underestimate of and consequent indifference to the value and the offices of

theology is allowed to prevail in Protestantism, its unsatisfactory conditions will persist, its progress be impeded, and its larger possibilities of reconstructive service remain unrealized.

Before theology can be brought back into the good repute to which it is entitled, the removal of certain hindrances lying in its path must be effected, and certain regulative principles and ideas followed in the restatement of its own content. By way of approach to and preparation for giving in brief outline some of the features of the doctrinal restatement called for, a passing word of attention may be given to several of the hindrances to which reference has just been made.

The first of these hindrances to suggest itself for mention, though not the most serious one, makes its appearance in the deflecting pressure which false and unwarranted demands on the part of congregations make on the minister. Those to whom he preaches, especially those who are charged with the official responsibility of managing outward congregational affairs and maintaining churches as going concerns, too often stress the material rather than the spiritual. They are interested in gathering crowds into the places of worship, rather than in the development of vital Christian personalities. The large establishments over which they preside must be financed, the public must be attracted, the spacious auditoriums must be filled, the philanthropies must be supported, the social activities must be maintained. To be effective in these matters, the minister must suit his message accordingly. Theological considerations, which make for moral vigor, religious growth and spiritual fruitfulness, having no popularity and lending but little assistance to the winning of public élat, are, unconsciously perhaps, remanded to the background in preaching, if not wholly silenced. The great verities of the Gospel—the fatherly love, the holy and righteous character of God; the Incarnation of the Divine Word, the redemptive truths of His hallowed and hallowing teachings, the impressive lessons of His Death, the hope-inspiring power of His Resurrection;

the renewing, refreshing and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit; and the fine and searching questions of personal and social ethics—all these, belonging to the long view of the Evangel, dealt with and rationalized by the ordered thought of theology, must give way for the discussion of moral platitudes or of current topics suggested by the daily papers, in order that immediate results may be attained. Whenever this is done in the interest of marketable success or popular applause, the Christian pulpit abdicates its throne. It obstructs the course along which Christianity must fulfill its mission. "Not all the popular or angelic preaching in the world will save a Church that thus surrenders the theology of its Gospel."

Another hindrance responsible for the disparagement of a living and serviceable theology lies in the perverse and mistaken loyalty with which men, in pulpit and pew, cling to traditional conceptions of the science of Christianity and the unmodified formulas in which those conceptions are set forth. What long ago should have been left as "outgrown shell by life's unresting sea," is venerationally regarded as a permanently established and sufficient standard by which to determine through succeeding ages whether or not integrity is to be ascribed to thought or fidelity to life. These obstructionists in the realm of religious thought not only decline to appropriate the light of modern scientific attainment, of historical investigation, of biblical criticism and of personal experience, but they are often hostile to the suggestion that such light can be or ought to be recognized by them. In the midst of the forward-moving stream of human achievement, the ancient formulas of faith lie anchored and unchanged. They have lost their power of appealing to the individual mind of today, and, being so largely devoid of the altruistic spirit, they have no vital message for contemporary life with its social outlook. The very terminology they employ betrays the religious views that are held—views which are no longer commanding either the assent of informed minds nor the approval of enlightened consciences. And this situation must continue to obtain, and

the Church's inefficiency meanwhile increase, until the membership of congregations is willing to be taught by preachers a theology that is hospitable to the truth as it is in Jesus, of course, but to truth as it is discovered elsewhere, also, in other realms of knowledge. In other words, the science of Christianity must voluntarily subject itself to the law of growth, just as other branches of human inquiry do, and realize that loyalty to truth must be given precedence over loyalty to the antiquated formularies of faith. And, if as the result of the overthrow and rejection of traditional theories and confessions, a theology after the War—quickenened and inspired by an open-minded devotion to the truth, alive to the practical needs and issues of the new day, and truly representative of the spirit the life and the teachings of the Master—will be forthcoming, one of the principal causes of prejudice against it will be removed and the necessity of its services to the Church, to the Nations, to Civilization, reestablished.

A third hindrance, active in undermining confidence in and respect for theology during recent years is to be found in the philosophical doubt which has assailed Christian ideals. Many of the leading scholars of the country, which since the Reformation has been most deeply absorbed in and most largely productive of theological learning, have shown themselves to be, if not satisfied with prevailing moral and spiritual conditions, in doubt as to the need and in despair of the possibility of introducing the Christian ideals into the relations of man to man in society, in business and in the state. They have allowed themselves to be driven along false paths of subserviency to worldly monarchs, and to throw their lot in with the philosophers of "world politics," who during the last fifty years have held up civil power and economic welfare as the central and all-important concern in the life of nations.

Were it true that opposition to such an unholy alliance between religious thought and a false political philosophy had made its first appearance during the War or since its close, it might be attributed to popular prejudice against and em-

bittered hatred of the Germans. But the opposition is not of so recent a date. Long before the War began, the taint of philosophic doubt and its enervating effect upon religious thought and moral life, had been manifesting itself in various directions. Men, who rejoiced in the liberty with which Christ had made them free, and who called no man Master save the Lord, held themselves aloof from an ecclesiasticism in which the promptings of autocratic power and of religious skepticism were in clearer evidence than the eternal truths of the Gospel. They were out of patience with and had lost respect for scholars, who, on entering ministerial or professorial careers, were willing to promise under solemn oath, among other things to "be submissive, faithful and obedient to His Royal Majesty," and to "preach and teach the Word as His Gracious Majesty may dictate." In an atmosphere, created by such autocratic requirements on the one side, and by such obsequious submissiveness to those requirements on the other side, the Voice of the Holy Spirit must be stifled, and men, even though ostensibly engaged in the quest after truth, become mentally enslaved. Instead of seeking "first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness," preachers and professors, wearing an autocrat's yoke, have surrendered intellectual freedom and given themselves to seek the kingdom of a ruler of this world and his approbation. And whatever their religious theories or theological pronouncements may then be, they cannot ring true to the note of the "good news of God" proclaimed by Him who is the Lord of lords and the King of kings. This was painfully realized years ago by German thinkers of the better type, no less than by scholars of other countries. One of the former, Professor Weinel, of Jena, in an article which appeared in the *Hibbert Journal* of July, 1909, on "Religious Life in Germany," strongly arraigns current thought and life, and boldly charges the unsatisfactory conditions to the account of misled philosophical and theological thought. The article concludes with these significant and arresting words:

"The resolve to achieve a new World, a Kingdom of God, is far too weak among us. I mean the aspiration after a world ruled by Truth, Love and Purity, in which all that is shameful in the political and social life of the present day shall be impossible; a world in which war and retaliation, duelling and revenge, prostitution and the exploitation of the unfortunate, and all that opposes the Will of a God of Love, shall be no more. Only when this lofty Ideal of the Christian Religion and of Christian Theology, shall be again preached and taught in all seriousness, when God shall be again vitally felt as ever-present with and speaking to us—only when Christianity, thus rejuvenated, again becomes powerful in our midst, will our generation appear to be inwardly not unworthy of the splendid age in which it outwardly lives."

These are weighty observations on the religious and theological situation of continental Europe a decade ago, and, coming from the source they do, the suggestion they make as to the soil from which the situation has sprung affords us valid ground for holding philosophic doubt and an enslaved intellect responsible for the hindrance religious thought and life have experienced under them. Had the implied warnings of Professor Weinell's words been promptly heeded, untold benefits would have speedily come to his countrymen—possibly the War itself might have been averted. And now that the obsession of a false politico-religious philosophy has met its doom, and preachers and professors been delivered from their subjection to the dictates of an irresponsible "overman," those warnings should receive readier attention among the people of the land from which they come. At the same time and with similar advantage, these warnings may be taken to heart by leaders of thought in our own country, and their suggestions followed in order that matters which hinder religion from making its appeal as effective as possible may be removed, and a post-war theology produced, whose compelling authority will be recognized, accepted and obeyed, whose life-transforming services will be gladly and gratefully acknowledged, by constantly increasing numbers.

If the widespread undervaluation and consequent disregard of ancient theological systems, and the weakness of present religious organizations, are largely due to obstructive causes that have been mentioned, could there be a time more opportune than our's for undertaking and prosecuting the work of theological reconstruction which is so necessary and important as the rational basis of and security for the spiritual life? In this day when the need of real religion is so generally recognized as the prime imperative in men's personal, social and civil life, no preacher or theologian can consistently leave undone a thorough explication, exposition and application of the truth of the Gospel in the light of modern knowledge, and in addressing himself to the performance of this duty, commanded by a Will higher than that of church officials or assemblies, he will doubtless find himself encouraged, rather than restricted, in such effort. Again, in this day when all departments of human learning are revising their data and exploring new fields, it should be evident even to reactionaries that finality can no longer be supposed to belong to either the theologies of the third or of the sixteenth century from which the hitherto dominant creedal statements and doctrinal standards have come down to us. In the last twenty-five years there has been a constant and rapid decrease in the number of men who are still ready to sin against the Holy Spirit by glorifying His work in the past, whilst denying, in a posture of bland obscurantism or sheer agnosticism, to others the right of beholding evidences of His continued activity in the present and expecting the multiplication of such evidences in the future. Our age which believes in the Christ that is, no less than in the Christ that was, and which longs to be theologically informed, will not close its ears to the message of the Gospel simply on the ground that it challenges it in new forms—forms that are consonant and consistent with the requirements of present-day knowledge and attainment. On the contrary, it will be all the readier to welcome the message clad in modern garb, instead of its ancient, ill-fitting and repellent

attire. And once more, in this day when men stand appalled amid the material devastations, the social and governmental ruins, and the awful sufferings, wrought by the catastrophe of War, when large numbers of men are surprisingly keen in asking questions theological—such as the being and character of God, Providence and prayer, suffering and sacrifice, the destiny of the soul and the assurance and meaning of life eternal—and when autocratic dictation and self-assumed authority are at even greater discount than the rates of exchange on the money-market, has not the hour struck for the living prophets of God, like those of old, to discard from religious thought that which has been outgrown, and to place a new emphasis, a new orientation, on the eternal verities? Just now there is a real hunger of the intellect for this, and if in new and available thought-forms religious truth can be given to minds, "it will reach men's hearts, if at all, by way of their heads—a most satisfactory route," many of us will agree with the author from whom the words are quoted.

It remains now, in the interest of order and emphasis, to recall and summarize some of the intimations that have emerged along the course of our discussion, and to offer for consideration several supplementary conceptions, suggested by current movements of thought as important elements in the content of a living theology, and as essential to the success of the reconstructive service of religion in the life of today and of tomorrow.

1. The revised theology, in order to be consonant and consistent with the Christian revelation and the reasonable demands of our age, will give added emphasis to the import and significance of that which in Matthew is called the "Gospel of the Kingdom." Modern scholarship has rendered a service of untold value to religion by its rescue of the long-neglected, often totally forgotten, teaching concerning the Kingdom of God. Prior to the last generation, Protestants too generally regarded religion as a heavenly life-insurance policy—a thing to be seen to once for all by individuals so as to win for them-

selves "title clear to mansions in the sky," and then allow them to go quietly and selfishly on with their personal tasks and in disregard of the world around them. Under the leadings of the Divine Spirit, the Christian mind of today has come to see that as the Master came forward to his generation with the Gospel of the Kingdom, dedicating his teaching and work very largely to the enforcement of its claims, so must his faithful followers approach the present and future generations with the message of the Kingdom, if the saving purposes of Christ are to be accomplished. Far too complacently and scornfully have men in the past regarded the reproach of their "other-worldly" interests as the cause of their having no interest in the betterment of the present world. The jolt given to men of this other-worldly type by recent war experiences should certainly arouse them to a deeper appreciation of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, and secure for it a less hesitant and more generous hospitality among them.

May it not be asked, indeed, whether there is any other aspect of "the good news of God," that could, if intelligently proclaimed, faithfully accepted and obediently practiced, contribute so large and enduring blessings to mankind? Does not the possibility, the hope, of establishing the law and reign of God on earth, as a world-wide Kingdom in which a common brotherhood is to be recognized and Christian love is to be the prevailing principle of life, loom out above the tragic failures and the dreadful mistakes of selfish and ambitious men and nations, as the one goal to which all human effort should be steadfastly directed? When Mr. H. G. Wells, one of the popular novelists of the day—for many of whose erratic views in the past one could not have much regard—finds himself constrained to say that "the Kingdom of God is the only possible formula under which we may hope to unify and save mankind," surely it is not too much to expect that theology, by undergirding faith with its reasoned thought, will sound the same note in the ear of religion, and insist that its message must be heard and heeded by men and nations, if civilization

is to be advanced, if abiding happiness, prosperity and peace are to be achieved.

2. In thus emphasizing the importance and significance of the doctrine of the Kingdom, modern religious thought and life will not neglect to stress at the same time the threefold corollary which accompanies it: The authoritative Kingship of God; Jesus' recognition of it in his life and teaching; and the office of the Holy Spirit in begetting, sustaining and justifying in men's experience, an unwavering confidence in it. This corollary brings us rather unexpectedly into the presence of another doctrine to which for a long while men have been disinclined to pay much attention. Rejected by Unitarian thinkers as an inscrutable mystery, baffling human understanding and inviting blind credulity, and neglected by the "orthodox" as valueless for practical religion, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity has not been proclaimed as essential to the intelligent apprehension and faithful appropriation of the redeeming love and the forgiving mercy of the eternal Godhead. One recalls that a French seer a generation ago declared "the work of the twentieth century would be to take out of the waste-paper basket a multitude of excellent ideas which the nineteenth century had heedlessly thrown into it." It can hardly be supposed that the Frenchman had in mind the doctrine here under notice. But isn't it true nevertheless that the extent of its recovery by the thought of the Church, will measure the depth of vitality and the degree of power which organized Christianity in the future will possess? And, what is more directly to the point here to be accentuated, is that for the due enforcement of the Divine Authority and its practical recognition in the control of human affairs, the doctrine is equally important and necessary.

Just as the *life* of the Church in its ideal character should present itself in entire subordination to the Divine Will, so must religious *thinking*, as a most important constituent part of religious life, hold itself entirely subject to an authority that is supreme. It may seem gratuitous to stress this conten-

tion. But when it is recalled that "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he," and that much of misleading error has crept into theological literature, and through it into the conduct and character of life, by allowing philosophic prepossessions, antiquated theories of the universe, false conceptions of the Scriptures, and ill-advised adherence to traditional confessions of faith, to be the dominating and determining factors in religious thinking, rather than the Will of God, the emphasis upon the latter as the sole authority to be regarded, cannot be thought a negligible consideration.

It certainly was not so thought of by him whom Christians own as their Lord and Master. In terms of a human life, Jesus is the perfect revelation of the character of God. He points out the way to the Father. He illustrates obedience to Authority, and shows what is to be attained by such obedience. He gives men an "Elder Brother's" pattern of what they may become by following his steps. These saving offices of his were understood by his earliest followers, and they deserve to be re-interpreted to the age in which we are living. "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments,"—obey the Will of Him who has authority to command. And, by his ever-present Spirit, the glorified Saviour reiterates this requirement and charges his followers with the responsibility of heeding it. By those who believe and observe this principle of life, his work has been carried forward age after age in unbroken continuity, and we may confidently expect religious thought and life in the present and in the future to be more than ever loyal to God's authority and to it alone. Christian faith will cling to the revelation of Him who said, "Lo, I come to do thy Will, O God!" It will cultivate "the mind that was also in Christ," and, with increasing joy and satisfaction, it will seek to bring "every thought into captivity to the obedience" of the authority to which Jesus invariably bowed—an Authority we come to know, according to George Adam Smith," by just using our knowledge, our reason, and every other intellectual gift that has been given us, with the accuracy and the courage of his own Spirit."

3. There is another long-discarded fact of human consciousness to be taken out of the waste-paper basket of the nineteenth century—if an additional reference to the Frenchman's phrase is permissible—by contemporary leaders of Christian thought and by their successors. It is the fact of Sin—sin not only as it is related to individuals but to associate life in family and business, in industry and trade, in state and nation. Under the combined influence of a widely-known, modern "theological system," according to whose theory sin is the outcome simply of human ignorance, and that of a deterministic psychology which has come forward in recent decades, and which regards sin as natural and necessary, as a reaction merely to this or that outward stimulus, and therefore nonmoral and blameless, the teachings of Jesus have been heedlessly flung aside. These superficial conceptions of sin and guilt argue that men need for their deliverance and salvation, a broader education, a deeper culture, rather than Divine pardon and the gift of a regenerate life. During the third decade of this century, less will probably be heard in support of such views than there was during the first decade. The hideous War which raged through half of the intervening years, struck a staggering blow to those fallacious theories. The world to-day sees, perhaps more clearly than ever before, what enormities of cruel suffering, what terrible wastes of property and life, may be entailed upon humanity through sin, through the wilful defiance of Divine Authority and the law of Love, by men in private life and in their organized relations. And with equal clearness it is seen, also, that educational and cultural attainments are not of themselves a sure guaranty against sin, and that the only reliable guaranty against it lies in the Gospel. If it required a dreadful war to overthrow misleading notions of sin, and to reestablished faith in the scriptural representation of its exceeding wickedness and appalling consequences, may we not presently find ourselves saying with Emerson, "I shall always respect war hereafter. The waste of life, the weary havoc of comfort and time, are overpaid by the vistas it opens of eternal life, eternal law, reconstructing and upholding society."

4. Were the "Seer of Concord" here to unfold to us the meaning of his words "eternal life" and "eternal law" as seen through the "vistas" opened by war, isn't it reasonably certain that he would mention certain spiritual realities the value of which has come to a new and higher appraisal within the last five years? Faithfulness to the call of duty, courage in facing hardship, patience in hours of suffering, self-sacrifice in the presence of a great principle—these have made their appearance, as in a blaze of light, in millions of instances, and declared to us once more what constitutes the essence of true religion. That they did this at a time when practical materialism seemed to be holding the whole world in its grip, when "*things* were in the saddle and *souls* were in the dust," when millionaires were glorified and saints laughed to scorn, lends added impressiveness to the fact. Those lives were irradiated by Christian virtues, they were aflame with fine moral issues, and, so far, they were Christ-like in what they did. Like Paul, they rejoiced in suffering and in sacrificing for others' sake and thus "filled up on their part that which was lacking in the afflictions of Christ." They effectively reproached the unwholesome pietism which revels in mystic sentiment, indulges in selfish emotions, and too often separates belief and practical ethics on the supposed ground of what it calls "the finished work of Christ." They taught us the lesson of the Cross anew, and, let us hope, the Church may have learned the lesson thoroughly enough to know in the future what theology must emphasize and religion practice. In other words, Christian thinking, in order to conform to the mind of Christ, must seek to arouse in men the incomparable value of faithfulness to religious duty, of heroic adventure in attempting the forwarding of Christian principle and enterprise, and of the spirit of cheerful and unhesitating self-sacrifice in the interest of the Kingdom of God and His Christ. These are the spiritual realities whose cultivation is of supreme importance and of eternal value. And, once this is realized as thoroughly as it should be, men's ambition to get on in the world, to amass wealth, to acquire fame, to

revel in luxury, to be in the swim of society, and to indulge in worldly pleasure, will be regarded in the comparison as wholly insignificant for human satisfaction. And to the teaching and learning of this, the lesson of the Cross, as reëmphasized in the recent experience of mankind, should come home to men's hearts with a commanding and compelling power—a power felt to have Divine sanction. Religious writing and Christian preaching should unite in making it clearer than ever that only by the sacrifice of self is redemption to be won for either the individual or the nation. Hence Christianity commands us to lift our eyes to the hill on which the Saviour died, and to gather instruction for our guidance from his example and experience. He died for others, only to gain for himself anew the life he had laid down at the behest of the Holy Will to which through life he was steadfastly obedient. Only those who heed his counsel by taking up their cross daily and denying themselves, are followers in his train, only they shall share with him the joy of the Lord.

BALTIMORE, MD.

II.

RELIGION AND MUSIC.¹

J. N. LE VAN.

Music has ever been the handmaid of religion and each has conferred a lasting benefit upon the other. If music has served religion by aiding in the expression of the loftiest hymns of praise or triumph, religion has more than repaid the service by raising music from the crude chant of the savage, or the wild raving of heathenism to the loftiest position among the productions of the human mind. The vision of that dim eternity of the past when the "foundations of the earth were laid," fired the imagination of the poet until he seemed to hear "the morning stars sing together" while the "sons of God shouted for joy."

When the wandering tribes of Israel became a settled community, schools of the prophets arose which seemed to have cultivated music as one of the necessary adjuncts of their office. The tide of religious song reached its highest point when the royal singer of the Psalms poured forth those sacred lyrics, ever the world's inexhaustible storehouse of the loftiest and deepest expression of every phase of religious thought and emotion. Under the son, Solomon, the great temple with its hosts of ministering priests and Levites arose. Then, almost unceasingly, the voices of the hosts of singers and the sounds of silver trumpets and the strains of harpers mingled in ascriptions of praise. Here was one of the culminating points in the history of religion and music. Many hints in the psalms point to an elaborate musical ritual in the temple service with processionals and antiphonal choruses and the employment of many instruments of music.

¹ This paper was read before the annual Missionary Conference of 1920 at the Theological Seminary and is here published by request.

In the course of history the Temple was destroyed, the priests and singers and players on instruments were carried away, to weep by the rivers of Babylon, when they remembered the songs of Zion which they could not sing in a strange land. The captivity ended, the temple was rebuilt, and ritual restored. This was followed by another declension in religion, and as religion waned music waned with it.

When the night was darkest and hope deferred had sickened the heart, the angels' song of "Peace on Earth," burst forth and hope was restored to the world. The art of music was at its lowest ebb at this time. The degenerate Greeks had neglected and forgotten much of the art. Then as the new religion opened thru the unlettered classes, their knowledge of music must have been next to nothing.

What would we not give to know what was the music that the Master and his disciples sang together on that last evening; or the tune to which was sung that hymn quoted by St. Paul:

Faithful the saying, great the mystery,
He was manifest in the flesh,
Justified in the spirit,
Seen of angels,
Preached among nations,
Believed on in the world,
Received up in glory.

Or that quoted by Clement of Alexandria:

Shepherd of the Sheep that own,
Their master on the throne,
Stir up thy children weak,
With guileless lips to speak.

Then followed the *Magnificat*, *Nunc Dimittis*, and *Te Deum*. The earliest school of distinctive Christian music was the Gregorian school of Rome in the seventh century. Much emphasis was laid upon the musical portion of worship as was shown by the violent reaction of the Reformers against music and musical instruments. After the third Public Disputation of Zwingli in January, 1524, the organs were removed from

the Protestant Churches. In 1525 the singing of the choir was eliminated and on December 9, 1527, the organ of the Great Münster was broken. Music was regarded by the reactionaries as a human addition to worship and not to be used, first because all music was connected with the Roman worship, and second, all music was in the Latin language, while Zwingli desired all to be in the vernacular. However, in 1529 music was again introduced into the worship in Zurich. When Calvin prepared his Liturgy he once more restored singing to its rightful place in the worship at Geneva.

Thus Puritanism and Pietism for a time might shut out music and other forms of art, but only for a brief time. Normal religious life with warmth of feeling and love of the beautiful, demand that they be restored to their rightful places.

The end of church music is simply one thing, and no other. It is worship—worship of the Creator of the human soul. Remembering this, we see how tremendous a thing it is we are dealing with. If we really believe it, then the thing we are speaking of is surely the most important in the world. It was so considered by the ancient Jewish Church; also by the early Christian Church; it is only in these late, hard, worldly, utilitarian times that a different opinion has come to be held.

To fulfill this, its mission, sacred music depends upon three things: its performers, the material they use, and their manner of using it.

For our directors of church music, pastors, organists, and choirmasters, we want to-day idealists—men who see visions, men who dream dreams. It is the idealist who is the practical man; it is the dreamer who helps the world along. It is the man who sees a vision of what his work might be, and is never satisfied with it as it is, who is ever striving after the perfect, and never gives in, though often baffled—he it is who is wanted to-day.

The music used in the church should be of the highest quality. It should be written by the best composers, and written as a rule, especially for church worship. Much that is heard

at present in our churches is far from conforming to this standard; so far, indeed, that in some instances it amounts to a positive scandal. On the other hand, music may be perfectly correct, and even highly artistic, from a technical standpoint, and yet unsuitable for church use.

Again, music may be both artistically good and solemn in tone, and yet, through its association with secular subjects, be highly unsuitable for church purposes. I think that this applies to all operatic selections, which, it is painful to notice, are becoming more and more frequently introduced into sacred worship. There is a vast storehouse of splendid devotional music especially adapted for it. If our pastors and musical directors would take more pains to find out and familiarize themselves with this, they would find that they had no time left for the introduction of alien and exotic productions.

The essential elements of sacred music are that it should be *vocal*, as distinguished from instrumental; and *choral*, as distinguished from solo music.

True vocal music is the perfect expression of words, their meaning and their spirit. Choral music is the expression of the feeling of a whole body, and is therefore, impersonal and best adapted for showing forth and assisting the worship of the church. It should be used as an ornament, and addition to the really important foundation work of the chorus, and not allowed to usurp first place. Church music could do very well with a chorus alone, if no good soloists were available, but could not, and should not depend upon soloists to the sacrifice of the chorus.

What is it that is radically wrong with vocal music, with choral music, and especially with church choral music to-day? The answer to this will be manifest when we take a backward glance at the history and evolution of vocal music.

Vocal music was originally a development of the natural movements of the voice in speaking, and from this we get our idea of the "music" of the poets. There is not to-day, in the strict technical sense of the word, music in poetry. The

musical sounds, if desired, must be supplied by the musician. But originally this was not the case. The poet himself sang his words, and so was both reciter and singer. Quite recently in the history of the world, about the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, there began instrumental usurpation. The dance tune, with its necessarily strict rhythm, began to be developed side by side with the development and perfecting of instruments and it has gone on ever since, advancing through sonata and symphony and tone poem, until its original source has been quite lost to sight.

As time went on, the attention of musicians became so engrossed with this fascinating study that they allowed vocal music of the old, true style to suffer neglect and decay, until its very memory became a thing of the past. To-day we are going round the cycle and beginning to see that by a return to the old methods and principles a new and better start can be made. Instrumental music implies harmony and strict rhythm; vocal music can exist in a high state of perfection and beauty without either. An anomalous thing has happened with regard to church music. While the rest of the world has laid aside and forgotten the old music, the church, more conservative, has retained some of the old forms, but forgotten the manner of using them, so that a strange hybrid form of art has appeared, with no justification in common sense, taste, or authority.

The old choral music of the Church should be free and unfettered, guided in its rhythm entirely by the proper pronunciation of the words. When the true rendering of this can be restored it will be seen that more will follow. The vocal style, once established, will breathe its spirit into the rendering of all church music down to the most modern composition of the twentieth century, and the inspiration of sacred words will resume its powerful influence.

We can not separate music and worship; the only question is how to combine them. And the chief justification for instrumental music in church is the help it gives to this end. If it

separate music from worship, the instruments are better away. They are better away if they preoccupy the Church with feelings or suggestions which are of the world (like the theatre or concert), or those which are esthetic rather than spiritual. Concert pieces, or music of that style, may be foreign to the spirit of worship. It may be religious but not worshipful. One could but welcome the movement by Pope Leo XIII to chasten his church music, and eject the modern style which was destroying worship; tho it seems going very far to use in the Sistine Chapel nothing later than Palestrina. Yet church music does not call for second-rate composers but for first-rate ones who keep art in the second place.

Music arose in Christian worship first, historically, from the custom of the Jewish Church; second, religiously, from Christian hymns, like the Magnificat, Nunc Dimittis, or Te Deum, which sprang from the overflow of the Christian heart; and, thirdly and practically, it arose as a vehicle for the contagious expression of truth in the early Church. The creeds were sung. At a later date music gave wings to the Reformation in hymns like Luther's; and those of early Methodism from Wesley did the like. And it may be noticed here that much of what is foolish and offensive in the way of hymns is found in those which aim at attracting or impressing the Church with its truth. Church music is there *to express the Church rather than draw the world*. Praise is more essential to the Church than popularity.

At first Christian worship was of the simplest kind, therefore its music was by the voice alone. This was caused also by the separation of the Church from Judaism and its protest against it. In respect of music there was both a legacy from Judaism and a reaction from it. The Jewish temple ritual was elaborate, antiphonal, and instrumental. It is a mistake to suppose that the Jews were puritans in this regard. But the synagog worship was much quieter, and had more effect on the Christian Church. There was reaction from the temple but continuity with synagog. As Greek influence grew in the

Church, its effect is seen not only in theology, but also in the abjuring of instrumental praise. Hellenism seems to have had no instrument in its ritual. The Christian praise was by voice almost entirely, as in the pagan world instruments were associated with worldly passion and frivolity; and the great soul-music was yet unborn. But the slow reception of the Apocalypse into the Church still did something to foster the ideal of instrumental, choral, and cosmic praise with trumpets, harps, and hosts.

This tendency was encouraged still more by the great influence of the Gregorian school of music at Rome about 600 A. D.

Liturgically, the Church felt the disorderliness and poverty of a mass of people taking part in worship on a spoken note. There was a loss of beauty, of solemnity, and especially of the unity, the decency, and order which worship implies. To express the soul of a mass of people calls for music, either as song or as oratory.

Art is not artificial. Our age and society become more musical. Music becomes a more common, and therefore, a more natural, vehicle of expression. Hence worship becomes more musical without being less natural. *We need simplicity, but there is one thing we need more, viz., naturalness, sincerity.* An affected simplicity is false and unfit for worship. And it is very common. Now what is the form of worship natural to a crowd? Something musical. In private worship a sober simplicity may be natural, and a conversational note. But public worship is not simply private worship in public. It is not individual prayer overheard. So also with praise. It has the corporate note. Hence we sing not lyrics but hymns—less poetic, perhaps, but more to the purpose. We do not pray or praise in public as we do in private. There is a volume, a compass, a reserve, a dignity, and even a stateliness, in public worship which can not and need not be in private. And there is an intimacy in private worship which, in public, is undue. So to make public worship natural we need music, and even an instrument to give it an expression natural to its collective and

congregational quality and dignity. People in church join in a musical tone where they are afraid of their own voices in a spoken note; and they go to worship where they get this vehicle. It is useless to complain of their not going to Church, if you refuse such means to make the service both congregational and beautiful—so long as it is earnest and sincere. What combines these public requirements is music—so long as the musicians do not take command. May I repeat that church music is there first, for the church and its uses, and only next for the public; *it is for praise, not enjoyment; it is spiritual, not esthetic.* The anthem is not a performance to conciliate a choir, but a sung sermon—a text with a musical commentary, where the comment should take its modest place, and where self-exhibition is sacrilege.

Musical worship should be congregational. It may be as elaborate as you like within that limit. If a picked chorus formed the whole congregation, the music might be highly artistic and yet natural and easy. But for most congregations it is responses, prayers, chants, hymns. Whatever it is, it should be congregational. To leave the singing to the choir or the praying to the minister is popish. It is strange that some should think it a rag and relic of Rome to have a congregation share the musical responses in prayer. It is just the opposite of Romish. Without abolishing anything so valuable as extempore prayer, the congregation should assert its place, and insist on participating publicly in the prayers, publicly and musically; since, as I have said, we get far more participation in a sung note than in a spoken.

In Romanism the minister is not simply a leader but a priest—he acts in place of the congregation, which he *rules*, more than he represents. So the choir was at first composed of clergy. They did the singing. The congregation was excluded, as is still the case in Italy. The choir there does not lead, but monopolizes, as clericalism always does. But in Protestantism, in democratic conditions, the congregation is the choir, the anthem is quite subordinate to the hymns or

chorals. The choir, so-called, is only a leader for use and service. And in the same way, the minister in worship is no priest, no substitute, but a guide. It is a rag of popery to let the choir alone sing, and to let the minister alone pray. He is no leader, if he do not lead, if no voice and tone follow his voice, if he monopolizes the speaking of God. And it is a burden which tends to injure him, as many could tell.

But, if praise be congregational, if it be worship and not exhibition, the music and the organ must also keep their proper place. The service of worship should never be a recital, or in any way preoccupied with instruments or artist. There are other occasions for that. The first place belongs to the intelligible word, the uttered word of truth and grace.

The main thing in our Protestant worship is not our message to God but God's to us. The people's tribute to God in worship is stirred by God's gift to his people. And that is the gospel word. Everything is created by God's gospel to us. Faith comes of hearing and grows into love. We must urge the supremacy and primacy of the word. God's living Word, Christ, is at the source of creation's praise. Now truly the great musicians feel the need of the intelligible word to crown all which the instruments can say; Wagner remedied by poetry, music's defect. But the classic illustration of this is in Beethoven's *Ninth Symphony*, where the instruments of all the orchestra are unable to utter the joy of the universe, and the voice and the word must come in to help the players out, and to crown the praise with the poet's glorious strain.

Even art feels, as faith knows, the fulness of completed being and its flush of perfect joy which broke on the world in the Cross to make men redeemed brothers in Jesus Christ to the glory of God the Father.

If the one end of church music, therefore, be worship it must be consistently subsidized to this end. There must be a unity running through the entire worship, a unity of thought, a unity of spirit, all of which may be accentuated by an intelligent choice of music. The key to such a service is in the hands of

him who plans the service, namely the pastor. It behooves him, therefore, to develop qualities of leadership in things musical as well as in every other phase of the pastoral work which enters into the arranging of consistent worship. He must be able to discriminate between that which is consistent with true worship and that which is not, between that which will lift the worshippers' hearts and that which will detract from the central purpose of the worship. This will apply to hymns, anthems and instrumental numbers as well. Ministers should cultivate by study and observation a sense of the fitness of music for worship and insist on the selection of music in accordance with its capacity for creating the spirit of worship and lending dignity to the service. *The pastor should be musical though not necessarily be a musician.*

Many organists lack poise, are not imbued with fidelity to the church and its services, but sacrifice consistency and merely make an appeal to the superficial emotions. In such a case the pastor must constitute himself a committee to suppress the undesirable.

The choir, sometimes characterized as the "war department" of the church, often presents problems for the pastor. The best advice as to how to handle the choir is "not to handle it at all." Confidence should be reposed in the organist or chorister, but a wise oversight should be maintained in order that his efforts may be subservient to the highest form of worship. Much may be added to the spirit of worship by insisting upon hymns being sung as hymns and not as merely tunes. Vast possibilities open themselves in the value of hymns in worship by suggesting the accommodation of the singing of tunes to the sense of the stanzas.

Careful study of the chants and canticles in connection with the church year is of the utmost importance in order that glaring inconsistencies and clashes may be avoided; for example, the use of the Gloria in Excelsis in connection with the Litany.

It is a duty of pastors to combat, tooth and nail, the snobbish, sensational, sensuous and sentimental attitudes, and to

nurture and cherish the truly healthy attitude—that which regards music as a high spiritual expression.

The opportunity of availing himself of a course in “musical appreciation,” in hymnology and hymnody, including the Gregorian, the Roman School, the work of Palestrina, the English School, the development and elaboration of choral tunes, and the modern tendencies—should be afforded to every student in our seminaries. The sense of propriety, of dignity, of unity, the development of a musical taste and sense, would remove much of the jarring, discordant and, oftentimes, disgusting inconsistencies of the worship in some of our churches.

It is the privilege and duty of pastors, and in their hands lies the task, to preserve the integrity of church music, not necessarily by adherence to the letter of an old form, but by being sure that the spirit of any form, whether new or old, is consistent with religious worship. Such church music is at once an aid and an inspiration.

Music the fiercest grief can charm, and fate's severest rage disarm,
Music can soften pain to ease, and make despair and madness cease,
Our joys below it can improve, and antedate the bliss above.

—*Pope.*

LEBANON, PA.

III.

PIERS THE PLOWMAN.

CHARLES EDWARD MEYERS.

The full title of the book under discussion in this paper is *The Vision of William Concerning Piers the Plowman*. Its authorship has been variously assigned, first to Robert Langley, then to William Langland, and, finally, as a result of extensive research in external data and minute analysis of the text itself, to a composite authorship covering a period of the last forty years of the fourteenth century. The facts supporting the theory of composite authorship were set forth about a decade ago by Professor Manly in an essay in the Cambridge History of English Literature. The truth probably is that the book was composed and revised at different times during the period from 1362 to 1398, the chief contributor being William Langland, to whom is to be ascribed the nature of its form and content, as well as the all-pervasive, sympathetic note of democracy that intones its spirit and makes it unique in the history of mediæval literature. It is an allegorical poem similar in general purpose to John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, with the essential difference, however, that whereas the *Pilgrim's Progress* is concerned wholly with the spiritual salvation of the individual soul, *Piers Plowman* is concerned, in addition to this, with the social and material salvation of the masses, and in its representation of the economic life-struggle of the middle and lower English classes of its day is the importunate voice of the rank and file of the people struggling in the wilderness of a tense and confused age for just and reasonable opportunity in the appropriation of the benefits and necessities of life. Begun in 1362, when the author was thirty years of age, he continued to revise and enlarge it during the three subsequent decades. The

numerous manuscripts still in existence, nearly half a hundred in number, attest the great popularity of the poem and represent it in three forms. The A text in twelve passus besides the prologue, 2,567 lines, contains the *Vision of Lady Meed*, a satire on the corruptions in church and state, the *Vision of Piers the Plowman*, or the search for truth, a satire on social conditions, and idleness; and the *Vision of Do-Well, Do-Better and Do-Best*, in which debate largely takes the place of allegory. The B text repeats most of the material of A, though with many variations in detail, and adds nine passus, the whole amounting to 7,242 lines. The C text by a few changes and additions brings the total of the complete poem to 7,357 lines. It was from a manuscript of the second form that Robert Crowley, vicar of St. Giles's, Cripplegate, first printed the *Vision of Piers Plowman*, in 1550, in a quarto volume of 250 pages. It was published to assist by its voice the great effort made towards reformation in the reign of Edward VI, and was so heartily welcomed that there were three editions at this date. It was again printed by Reginald Wolfe in 1553, and after the interval of Mary's reign, again by Owen Rogers in 1561. But Langland's work was known to very few when, in 1813, Dr. Thomas D. Whitaker printed an edition of it from the third and latest manuscript. It was edited again by Mr. Thomas Wright in 1842 and 1856, and in 1867, 1869 and 1873, each of the three forms of the manuscripts of *Piers Plowman* was represented, with a collation of all the best manuscripts, in editions prepared for the Early English Text Society by the Rev. W. W. Skeat, Professor of Anglo-Saxon in Cambridge University. Notes, Introductions, and Indexes followed in 1877 and 1885; and in 1887 an incorporation of all the results of twenty years of study in a library edition that gives all the forms of the work. The latest edition is that by Professor Skeat in 1900. What is there in the form and contents of this book or its impression upon the world in thought or art, that enabled it to force itself upon the attention of scholars and printers and, to some extent, of a portion of the reading public persistently for well-nigh six hundred years?

Any book, assuming, of course, that it has passed the simpler tests of recognition, and has had a temporary vogue, or continues to have a permanent place in the realm of thought or letters, or if indeed, it be of no literary value at all, may be interesting and important from any one or even a considerable number of different points of view. *Gismond of Salern*, for example, and *Promos and Cassandra*, except to the most expert specialist, are only names without meaning or suggestion, and the books of which they are the titles are rude in art and risqué in substance; and yet they are incalculably significant as disclosing the primitive beginnings of English romantic drama. Only the hermit student reads Henslowe's *Dairy* of the pawn-broking business that he conducted with some of the predecessors and contemporaries of William Shakespeare, of the plays he bought and the prices he paid for the equipment of the chain of theaters operated in competition with Shakespeare, but what a tremendous loss it would be to our knowledge of the Age of Elizabeth, if we did not have Henslowe's invaluable record. John Lyly's *Euphues* has been forgotten by the reading public for more than three hundred years, but it was one of the most important books of its day as reflecting the social ideals of English aristocracy at what some regard the peak of its glory, became a manual of public and private morals, and set the fashion for a prose style that was superseded only by the appearance of Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*. Percy's *Reliques of Ancient Poetry* is not a great book, but who can estimate its influence as a factor in the development of romanticism in English poetry with all that such a movement meant for English life and literature? I don't suppose very many now-a-days read Charles Brockden Brown's novels, or Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*, or John Dickinson's *Letters from a Pennsylvania Farmer to the Inhabitants of the British Colonies*; quite likely there are more who read Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*; but the fact is, nevertheless, that "the work of Brown fixed his place for all time in American literature as the first professional man of letters and important creative writer of the

English-speaking portion of the new world; that of Paine by the boldness and universality of its appeal swept its readers from all their moorings out into the ocean of experiment and fascinating chance; that of Dickinson secured for the cause of human liberty and Anglo-Saxon unity a calm consideration from all opposing parties and won the unstinted praise of Franklin, Voltaire and Burke, not to mention the privilege accorded him later to draft the most important of the state papers by which the first continental congress demonstrated to the world that provincial America could produce statesmen worthy to rank with the best of any age and land; and that of Harriet Beecher Stowe, with all its inartistic crudities, stirred the world, and became one of the most effective influences that brought on the War of the Rebellion and freed three million slaves." The work of none of these authors is great literature, but it is important and influential literature, far-reaching in its significance because of the conditions in which it had its origin and the permanent results attending its dissemination. And so, too, it is with Langland's *Piers Plowman*. *Piers Plowman* is not great literature. There are those, indeed, who assert that it is not even good literature, except here and there in spots, and very meager spots at that. As we understand it, from an academic point of view, a great book is one which, not being composed merely to convey information, or to serve a practical purpose, expresses the essential truth of life, genuine or significant emotion or thought, and expresses it in a beautiful way. It is a book which worthily expresses man's ideas, impressions, and discoveries of the permanent things of life. Great books are the works of the greatest spirits, the men and women who have observed most keenly, felt most truly, and thought most deeply and widely, who are soundest or wisest in emotion or thought; but who besides have been gifted with the faculty of clear, forceful, and artistic expression, to convey their experiences to the world in the finest and most enduring written forms, with universality, imaginativeness and spontaneity. To this category—the category of Homer, Virgil,

Dante, Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, Cervantes, Goethe—William Langland does not belong. That he was a keen observer of life, that he was a great spirit who felt deeply and thought most truly, that he was potentially a poet who wielded no uncertain influence in the life of his century, cannot be gainsaid. But unfortunately he lacked "spirits to enforce, art to enchant" later generations. His great misfortune with respect to the permanent literary value of his work lies in the facts that even if he had at times a clear, forceful, expression, only rarely did he have artistic expression that makes for permanence and that he wrote in a poetic form that was not only dead, but was being rapidly forgotten in the presence of a new, passionate, colorful, rhythmic poetry introduced into England from the recently awakened life of the Italian Renaissance. Secondarily interesting and notable as being the first English poem of any consequence produced in the language of the people following the Norman Conquest of 1066, antedating Chaucer's *Book of the Duchess* by seven years, and that from it may be gleaned representative details that assist in reconstructing later medieval English society, its chief interest and claim to recognition and study lie in its being the first piece of *English literature to strike a distinctively democratic note and turn from king and noble and court to the lowly human heart and need and proclaim the gospel of social and industrial freedom, and religious purity and sincerity.* Of a low social extraction and the limited education of a contemporary rural pastor, familiar from his earliest years with the poor folk of town and country, but with a mental alertness that interested both high and low in his message, William Langland saw with marvellous clearness the greatness and weakness of the Middle Ages; and finding in the words *duty* and *work* the most essential of all life motives, he drove it home with the enthusiasm of a Carlyle to the bosoms of all whose lives were dominated by no lofty principle; and though the work that he has left behind is rather only the rough-stuff of which literature is made than literature itself, its author became, through the reformatory

effectiveness of his poem, one of the preëminent agencies for good in the remolding of the national life of England. If we were required to find for him a succinct characterization, we should call him the great commoner in an age of highly artificial civilization, and epitomize his teaching as being that of the earlier and simpler New Testament philosophy of life, with its emphasis upon the worthiness and sanctity of the ordinary relations of men and the sufficiency of these, rightly observed, for human happiness.

The fourteenth century in England, covering the reigns of Edward II, Edward III, and Richard II, 1307-1399, has been well called a century of confusion, notwithstanding it is also one of several periods of English folk-life to which has been not ineptly applied the terms "Merry England." When the whole body of facts is taken into consideration the two characterizations are not inconsistent. With all the romantic idealism and seemingly high ethical standards of chivalry, life was not quite so merry as those of us are wont to imagine who get our pictures of it from the joyful portraits of Chaucer's verse. It is true that one can scarcely find a more lightsome life, apparently, than that which prevailed in the days of the Canterbury pilgrims, unless it be that of the days of the Virgin Queen; but it is no less true, also, that one can scarcely find in the annals of English History, a more sordid, tragic, and pathetic tale than this hundred years, but from the travail and confusion of which, it must be added, the English people emerged with a new national consciousness, a very definite trend toward a new order of social organization, a new language and literature, and a very auspicious beginning of a new conception of the substance and practice of the Christian religion. It would seem that individuals and nations sometimes may be merriest when their surroundings are darkest and that not infrequently environing confusion may be only the dormant chaos from which the brooding spirit of God brings forth a happier order. The fact is that from the very beginning of this century on every hand were signs of approaching change from the com-

parative stability of the existing age. Like all the rest of Europe, England was growing impatient of the cramped life and restricted thought of earlier times. "She was already restless with the throbbings of that new life which was to find expression in the Renaissance. The old medieval world yet remained, but everywhere in the midst of its most characteristic institutions were presaging evidences of the new order destined to take the place of the old, while the latter was yet at the height of its splendor." Nor could it well have been otherwise than just such a century of confusion; for even if there had not been slowly filtering in from abroad disturbing influences from a new "*weltanschauung*" prevalent in the great intellectual centers of the continent, there was an ominous, growing situation at home that was gradually bringing such a condition into being. Underneath the beautiful, knightly garb of English chivalry that clothed existing social life were the miserable ills that always attend governmental and ecclesiastical maladministration, and which are ever intensified when such maladministration is but the natural issue of a political system based on the principle of discrimination in the spiritually-intrinsic worth of human life with its logically associated idea of special privileges for the few as over against the general interest and common weal. Let us not forget in our delineations of feudalism, that side by side with the luxurious life of the noble Lord of the fourteenth century in the solid masonry of his Norman Castle, with his fine ideals of love and war, so charmingly extolled in prose and verse: that side by side with the prosperous proprietorial life of the manor houses in the open and fertile places, but huddled together a little apart from these, were the squalid hovels of the submerged crowd, in which life moved miserably in a fixed and contracted orbit, shut up in seclusion or held to a dreary monotony of toil. How little do we hear of this element of human kind in the vivid descriptions of those splendid days when knighthood was in flower! One cannot but feel sometimes that, for the most part, until comparatively recent days, literature has been rather an exclusive art in the

matter of the life-experiences from which its content has been drawn. In contrast with the merry and well-to-do life of these two former classes, there came into the existence of this last for comfort, opportunity and enhancement, little enough beyond "the unvarying routine of restricted villenage and serfdom." In the feudal system of society they had been overlooked. In the rural sections bound to the soil by statutes that made them little better than irremovable chattels, passed from landlord to landlord by deed of property conveyance, although there did exist the possibility of their becoming free laborers; in the cities industrial toilers or servants in the households of the nobility, they were regarded with inferior consideration not as citizens whose welfare was the beneficent business of the state equally with the welfare of their superiors, but as adjuncts to the convenience and exaltation of the higher classes. Kings and nobles of the century were too busy with personal ambitions, competitions and contentions among themselves for preference and pelf to give heed to the growing sense of the rights of these, except to grant an occasional grudging concession for temporary appeasement. It was Richard II, I think, who poured the cup of oppression full to overflowing when at Waltham he said to the men of Essex who confronted him with his recent charter of freedom: "Villeins you were, and villeins you are. In bondage you shall abide, and that not your old bondage, but a worse." And cardinal, bishop and priest were no different. The feudal world had gotten into their hearts as well, and they were mainly occupied with politics and property, instead of the things of the invisible kingdom of God in the hearts of men and in the state. "It is true that in the great city of London my Lord of Church or state passed by resplendent in bright-colored silks and velvets, his numerous retainers clothed each in his distinguishing livery, gorgeous processions and pageants with banners and waving plumes, exemplifying the external culture and refinement of feudal civilization, but it is also true that hunger and oppression and the cruel indifference of these same angust personages were heavy on the poor."

The preceding century had witnessed a most hopeful achievement in the Great Charter of English liberty. Langton and his advisers had striven to formulate all the grievances under which the nation groaned and the charter seemed to promise substantial relief to the common folk, but unfortunately that great document turned out to be in the last analysis, only a feudal document after all, with the rights that it enforced only feudal rights. It proved to be a charter of liberties, rather than one of liberty, the liberties enumerated in its sixty clauses failing to touch the most vital need of the nation, the status and fortunes of the greater body of Englishmen who were still villeins or serfs; and quite on the contrary from what was fervently expected from the charter's operation, the fourteenth century witnessed a type of feudalism more showy and less simple than that of its predecessor, in which the charter was won; and even if there was more external refinement in men's relationships to each other, it only covered a more essential coarseness and unreality. The first reign of the century, that of the second Edward, was in every respect a grievous fiasco, a gruesome tragedy of two decades, in which the minds and energies of statesmen, instead of being occupied with affairs of state as these pertained to the needs and progress of the general citizenship of the kingdom, were occupied with plot and counterplot to gain precedence and self-aggrandizement. As might have been foretold by the dullest prophet that reign came to a climax in the loss of Scotland to the English crown for the remainder of the Middle Ages, and without putting into operation any enlightened constructive policy or accomplishing much of progressive development, finally to an end with Edward foully done to death in prison at Berkley Castle. Perhaps the most worthless of all British kings, the somber gloom of his fate is rendered more wretched by his utter disregard of the common man in his realm and the selfish aims and unworthy character of his associates and opponents. The second reign of the century, that of Edward III, was better and more efficient, it is true. Wiser in his outlook upon life and more capable than his

father, similar in many personal qualities, to his grandfather, Edward I, he represented the best type of fourteenth century knighthood, and his administration of governmental power bore considerable fruit in constitutional government, notably the right of Parliament to audit the national accounts, the creation of the House of Commons, and the exclusion of ecclesiastics from the great offices of state; but his period of rule, unfortunately, was marred by the greater part of the Hundred Years' War, with its unprecedented brutalities, the Peasant Revolt under Wat Tyler and John Ball, and the thrice repeated visitation of the Black Plague. For more than a hundred years there was not a town on the Scottish border, or on the channel coast, or facing the North Sea, or in the heart of England, or was it London itself, but it was surrounded by great defensive walls on which men kept their everlasting watch, grim evidence of internal enmity and uprising. For more than a hundred years the English channel largely bereft of commerce, was chiefly a highway for the traffic of war, which begun at the opening of the second third of the fourteenth century, continued, except for brief intervals, until the end of the first half of the next, frequently without cause or sense, unless these be found in the jealousies, ambitions, and martial propensities of the landed aristocracy. This alone, one might think, would have been sufficient to make the century one of confusion, if there had been nothing else. It is not surprising that we can read in *Piers Plowman* scathing arraignments of conscienceless merchants regrating in the commercial centers of England by cornering the markets in produce and provisions and retailing them to a war-weary public at gigantic profits, or that as relief from the hardships of life and the monotony and tension of strife, the multitude should refuse to work and flock in unheard-of numbers to the popular pass-times of bear-baiting and cock fighting in the fields and gardens and wooden buildings about Southwark on the Thames, with their affiliated haunts of vice, or that they should openly indulge in gross immoralities and shameless disregard of even the ordinary decencies of social

relationships! And what with the Black Plague sweeping over Europe from the East, decimating populations and causing untold misery to an age that had no sanitary science, the confusion was worse confounded and added indescribably to the already galling burdens of the populace. The Black Plague came to England in 1349, 1361, and 1369. It is estimated to have carried away half the inhabitants of the island, fixed by the most generous computation at five millions, by the most conservative at two and a half. Harvests ripened and rotted in the fields for want of reapers, and famine followed pestilence. The country was over-run with vagrants driven by idleness and starvation to beggary or theft. The organization of labor was completely unsettled, and iron laws were passed that merely made matters worse; and then out of the economic muddle came bitter denunciations and riotous uprisings against all those feudalistic distinctions which had been accepted for years, in ignorance and weakness by the lowly, and by the higher classes who profited by them, in sophisticated satisfaction and power as part of an order divinely arranged. And so too, in religion the times were out of joint. The church no longer inspired the simple faith and devotion that distinguished the days of the early crusader. In 1309 the Pope had removed from Rome to Avignon and the reverence and divinity that had hedged him about as the declared Vicar of Christ on earth were greatly lessened when Englishmen saw him the creature of the growing power of France. The multiplying corruptions of the church itself, the worldliness and lack of spirituality in the clergy, moved earnest men of all estates—particularly students and professors in the universities, to scorn and satire, and bewilderment as to what these things were ultimately going to come to. Long years before, over in Galilee a shrewd but humble prophet, when he saw something of the same conditions among his own people spoke a parable unto them and said: "And when ye see these things come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh. . . . Behold the figtree and all the trees; when they now shoot forth,

ye see and know of your own selves that summer is nigh at hand. So likewise ye when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled. Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away." And these indeed were the things that were coming to pass. Both a prophet and the summer were nigh at hand. There was hardly any sphere of life that was not permeated by the spirit of unrest rising up at home to meet and welcome the new forces coming in from without. The age of chivalry was slowly but surely being leavened, and out of the accompanying complexity and agony of it all the preparatory foundations were being laid for a new age, in which the long dominating feudal ideal in church and state with its ecclesiastics and nobles and villeins and serfs would be antiquated things of the past, in the substitutions of a less pompous and arbitrary and more democratic social order, a liberal reorganization of the interests and activities of men, not based on force, or blood, or wealth, but on thought and moral worth, and that would recognize at least to an appreciable degree, the universal right to achieve by worthy citizenship and work a just opportunity in the more common good things of life. This, in briefest possible sketch, is the darker and yet propitious confusion-side of what we customarily think of as "Merry England." And it is in the laying of these foundations and against this darker background that the real significance and influence of *Piers Plowman* are set in true relief. That poem is a vision of this world of fourteenth century human life as it appeared to the observant eyes of a sympathetic, sensitive poet of the people who was in that world, but not of it. Speaking the mind of the main body of the English people of its time, it is a vision of the ideals of Jesus Christ seen through the thick clouds of humanity, a spiritual picture of the labor to maintain and uphold the life spent upon duty done for love of God.

And now let us turn to the book itself. Without rhyme, unless by accident, and with alliteration in First English form, *Piers Plowman* is a series of visions or dreams set forth in

figurative language, well-sustained to the end, frequently with great subtlety of reasoning and always embodying the purest aspirations. Everywhere it gives flesh and blood to its abstractions by the most vigorous directness of familiar detail, so that every truth might go home, even by the cold hearthstone of the hungriest and most desolate, to whom its words of wise sympathy were read from manuscript or recited from memory.

The whole consists of the mystical number of nine visions. The first vision includes the Prologue and Passus I, II, III, and IV; the second Passus V, VI, and VII. The remaining fifteen Passus make up the other seven visions, and all are included in the second part of the poem, *Do-Well, Do-Better, and Do-Best*, which is a logical sequel to Part I, but not so well known. It were difficult, if not indeed, a hopeless task, to give an adequate epitome of all these visions in the minuteness of their application. I shall confine myself, therefore, to the meagerest outlines, with some quotations from the original Middle English to illustrate the language, structure, and thought.

The scene is laid in the Malvern Hills, in Landlady's day a desolate wilderness, appropriately chosen, no doubt, for its suggestiveness of the existing wilderness of English life. The poet lies down one May morning and falls asleep upon the grass, to dream, as he says, of "all the wealth of this world, and woe both." Between the sunrise, where rose in the east the Tower of Truth, and the sunset, where death dwelt in a deep dale, he has a vision of a fair field full of folk.

In a somer seson—whan soft was the sonne,
I shope me in shroudes—as I a shepe were,
In habite as an heremite—unholy of workes,
Went wyde in this world—wondres to here.
Ac on a May mornynge—on Maluerne hilles,
Me byfel a ferly¹—of fairy, me thouzte;
I was very forwandred—and went me to reste
Under a brode banke—by a bornes side,
And as I lay and lened—and looked in the watres
I slombred in a slepyng—it sweyved so merye.

¹ Marvel.

Thanne gan I to meten—a meruelouse sweuene;²
 That I was in a wildernesse—wist I never where;
 As I beheld into the est—an heigh to the sonne,
 I seigh a toure on a toft³—trelich⁴ ymaked;
 A depe dale binethe—a dongeon there-inne,
 With depe dyches and derke—and dredful of sight.
 A faire felde full of folke—fonde I there bytwene,
 Of alle maner of men—the mene and the riche,
 worchyng and wondryng—as the worlde asketh.
 Some putten hem to the plow—pleyed full selde,
 In settyng and sowyng—swonken⁵ ful harde
 And wonnen that wastours—with glotonye destruyeth.
 And some putten hem to pruyde—apparailled hem thereafter,
 In contenaunce⁶ of clothyng—comen disguised.
 In prayers and in penance—putten hem manye,
 All for love of owre lorde—lyueden ful streyte,
 In hope for to haue—heuenriche blisse;
 As ancre and heremites—that holden hem in here selles,
 And coveten nought in contre—to kairen aboute,
 For no likerous⁷ lifode⁸—her lykam⁹ to plesse.”

Thus the poet continues to the end of the Prologue, pointing out and characterizing in brief but pointed descriptions the individuals and types in his field full of folk, not forgetting their several virtues as well as their vices. Here are minstrels who “geten gold with her glee”; jesters and babblers who “feynen fantasies and foles hem maketh”; bidders and beggars, their “belies and bagges with bred fully crammed”; pilgrims and palmers; the four orders of friars, “who preched the people for profit of hem selven”; a pardoner “as he a prest were”

Broughte forth a bulle—with bishopes seles,
 And seide that hym-self myghte—assoilen¹⁰ hem alle
 Of falshed of fastyng—of vowes ybroken.
 Lewed men leued hym wel—and lyked his wordes,
 And they geuen here golde—glotenes to kepe.

² Dream.

³ A cleared space.

⁴ Choicely.

⁵ Labored.

⁶ Outward Show.

⁷ Luxurious.

⁸ Means of life.

⁹ Body.

¹⁰ Absolve.

Here, too, are doctors and masters and lawyers, lords and ladies and servants, barons and nobles, baxters and butchers, weavers and tinkers, masons and miners, a lunatic and a king—a picture of the everyday world of men, with their religion, their business, and their pleasures, their sincerities and deceptions, their serious interests and their vanities. And closing the Prologue is the familiar fable of the rats and mice that tried to bell the cat. The author applies it as a parable to the power of Edward III's son, John of Gaunt, the richest noble in England, the wielder of royal authority in the last years of his father's weakness, and who was believed to be looking forward to possession of the throne. Detested by the commonalty he was the cat that the rats and mice attempted to bell. The figure is a veiled suggestion that no substantial gain is to be hoped for. Though we might bell the cat, what of the kitten? Could the misery of the land with John of Gaunt foremost at court be less when it had a child for king?

While the dreamer is contemplating in amazement the field full of folk, from the Castle on the Hill there comes down to him a lovely lady who calls him by his name.

Sone, sleepest thou? Seest thou this people
How busy they ben—about the mase;¹¹
The moste partie of this people—that passeth on this erthe,
Hane thei worschip in this worlde—thei wilne no better;
Of other hevene than here—holde thei no tale.
I was aserd of her face—theigh she faire were,
And seide, “Mercy, Madame—what is this to mene?”
The toure up the toft’ quod she—trewthe is there-inne,
And wolde that ghe wroughte—as his worde techeth;
For he is fader of feith—fourned ghaw alle,
Bothe with fel and with face—and gaf ghaw fyve wittes
For to worschip hym ther-with—the while that ghe ben here.

Continuing the fair lady tells the poet how the elements are to serve man, and yield all that man needs—clothing, food, and drink without excess. “Tho man may desire much, temperance

¹¹ Confused throng.

is medicine, All is not good for the spirit that the body asks."

But what is the meaning of the "deep dale and dark," the sleeper asks,
 "That is the castel of care—who so cometh therinne
 May banne¹² that he borne was—to body or to soule.
 Therinne wonieth a wighte¹³—that wronge is yhote
 Fader of Falshed—and founded it hym-selue."

"It was he who urged Eve to sin; who was the counselor of Cain; who tricked Judas with the silver of the Jews and hanged him on an elder tree. He is the hinderer of love, and lieth always; he betrayeth soonest those who trust in earthly treasure, to encumber men with covetousness." Of course, the dreamer would want to know who this lady is that tells him such wise things from Holy Writ. Asked her name she says, "I am Holy Church, thou oughtest to know me, I received thee at the first, and made thee a free man. Thou broughtest me sureties to fulfill my bidding, to believe in me and love me all my life time." Whereupon the dreamer kneels to Holy Church, asks grace of her, begs her prayers for his amendment, and seeks to know of her how he might save his soul. It would be difficult to improve upon her answer, even out of our most modern systems of thought.

"Whan alle tresors aren tried," quod she,—*"trewthe is the best;*
Whoso is trewe of his tonge—and telleth none other,
And doth the werkis therewith—and wilneth no man ille,
He is a god bi the gospel—agrounde and aloft,
And ylike to owre lordes."

In the second Passus of the first vision the poet inquires of Holy Church how he may recognize Falsehood from Truth. For reply she bids him look about him, and so doing he beholds Falsehood and Flattery standing by his side; but behind these two is a woman in shining apparel, the lady Meed, otherwise Reward, or Bribery, who is to become Falsehood's bride on the morrow. With that fine sense of loyalty to the Church evinced

¹² Curse.

¹³ Wicked person.

by Langland throughout the whole poem, notwithstanding he criticizes her worldliness without hesitancy, when material Reward appears he makes Holy Church vanish. Falsehood and Flattery and Meed remain to arrange the marriage of Falsehood and Meed and call upon Simony and Civil to read a deed of conveyance of the property with which the bridal couple are to be endowed; when everything seems to be satisfactorily adjusted a great obstacle arises. Theology objects to the union, disputing its legality. To settle the question they all agree to repair to the king's court, and they ride away to London, Meed on the back of a doughty sheriff, Falsehood on a sisour. However, things go wrong again before the king, that worthy becoming very angry and threatening to punish Falsehood severely, if he can catch him. Badly frightened, all of the party run away except Meed, who is made a prisoner and later brought before the king again for trial. At the trial Meed is secretly assured by the judges that all will go well. To make a good impression she confesses a friar, offers to pay for a church window, and immediately afterwards informs the mayors and justices how to increase their wealth by taking bribes. The king being of the opinion that she should receive some light punishment for desiring to marry Falsehood, proposes that she shall marry Conscience. But Conscience strenuously objects, exposing Meed's undesirability as a wife in his speech before the Court. A great argument follows between Meed and Conscience; in which Meed attempts to justify herself, and Conscience refutes her assertions, the latter quoting Saul to prove the evil of covetousness and declaring that Reason shall one day reign upon the earth and punish every wrong. And now the mention of Reason by Conscience gave the King a suggestion for solving the difficult situation. He sends out for Reason, who presents himself accompanied by Wit and Wisdom, with conditions still more improved by the unexpected entrance at the same time of the benign figure of Peace, who makes such an effective speech against Wrong that the king is almost persuaded. But unfortunately while Peace is speaking

Wrong wins over Wit and Wisdom by the assistance of Bribery. However, the day is not lost. Reason has the last speech, and he is very eloquent. Firm in his conviction, he shows no pity, and appeals so persuasively to the king for strict justice that the latter accedes and begs Reason to remain with him forever after. Meed is married neither to Falsehood nor to Conscience. And here the dreamer awakes.

It hardly needs to be observed, of course, that the true effectiveness of this first vision does not consist in the interest or complexity of its plan. Simple almost to obviousness, there is little in it of the art of great story-telling to attract or entertain. The chief value of it lies in its having been merely used as a peg on which to hang what the poet meant to be the chief interest—the presentation and criticism of the outstanding facts of current life as these are set forth in the speeches of his impersonated abstractions. Looking out over his field of folk Langland saw that Conscience and Wisdom and the desire for Peace were not lacking in the bosoms of men, as were neither Falsehood nor Bribery nor Wrong. His court scene is but the picture of the conflict of these in the real world of real men.

But the poet falls asleep again, and again the field full of folk is present in his dreams. Meantime something had happened in English history. A great tempest had occurred, January 15, 1362. Moreover, two of the terrible pestilences were still fresh in the peoples' memory. The tempest had lasted five days, with much destruction of life and property, including part of the Norwich Cathedral. What did these things mean? The Vision of the poet reveals Reason preaching to the assembled multitude, reminding them that these catastrophes were judgments of God. Touched by the moving power of his preaching as he describes the wrath and justice of God, the multitude, one by one, come forth to repent and confess their iniquities, in the allegorical impersonation of what the poet regarded the seven deadly sins of his day. The first to come forth is *Pride*, who promises Reason that she will be humble. *Luxury* vows that hereafter she will drink nothing

but water. The third is *Envy* who confesses his evil thoughts and covetousness and his attempts to injure his neighbor. *Wrath* is a friar, whose aunt was a nun, and who was both cook and gardener to a convent. He is mournfully sorry for having incited so many to quarrel and enmity in the religious houses in which he served. *Avarice* confesses how he lent money on usury, how he lied and cheated, and who not understanding the French word "resitution," thought it was another word for robbery. The sixth is Gluttony, who, tempted into an ale-house, gets gloriously drunk first and repents afterwards. The last is *Sloth*, a priest who knows his Robin Hood better than his prayers, and who can find a hare in the field better than he can read the lives of the saints. When they have all confessed themselves and pledged better lives, Repentance makes fervent supplication for the group. What now shall they do with their regenerated lives? How shall they achieve sanctification? They determine that the best thing to do is to search for Truth. In that pursuit only will they find sanctification and happiness. But unfortunately none of them know the way. At this point in the allegory Piers Plowman enters for the first time, who says that he has been, in his lowly life, a traveller for years on the highroad of truth. Pointing out the direction, he also indicates the many sign posts and deviations, through meekness and righteousness and love to a father God, in whom alone truth is to be found. While Piers is giving his instructions there comes upon the scene a pilgrim dressed like a Saracen. Perhaps he has been to the shrine of truth? Alas! he has travelled far and wife to Rome, and Alexandria, and through the Holy Land, and even now is just returned from Sinai, but never has he heard of a Saint called Truth, or that there was a shrine to his honor. At last Piers Plowman is prevailed upon to go with the company as guide, when he has plowed his half-acre. And how appropriate it is that when Piers has given his promise, the scene of this commendable enterprise Pride, Luxury, Envy, Wrath, Avarice, Gluttony, and Sloth and a thousand others bent upon finding Truth, should close with Hope in

heaven blowing a horn and all the saints in Paradise singing together to its music; and that Piers should deliver a discourse on the supreme value of a holy life in preference to the Church's official pardon, at the last Great Day. Nor must it be forgotten that all through the vision are interspersed minute accounts of the living conditions of the poor, condemnations of labor uprisings based on force, and much wise advice about the use and abuse of prosperity. The dreamer awakens in the midst of a bitter discussion with a priest on the efficacy of bulls of pardon and indulgences.

Time will permit only a brief word about the second part of the poem. It is a logical sequence to Part I, in that Part I, emphasizing the futility of formal religion, or faith without works, naturally looks forward to Part II, which is an exposition of what constitutes that true religion and successful living whose end shall be salvation; namely an increasing search for Do-Well, Do-Better, and Do-Best. The chief impersonated abstraction in Part II is Thought, who presents Do-Well as man's instinctive tendency to the good; Do-Better as man's cultivation of his native qualities until they become Christian graces; and Do-Best as the achievement of perfection in the beautiful fulness of genuine son-of manship. Do-Well involves honest labor and takes only that which by right belongs to it. Do-Better is benevolent helpfulness to others and breaks the bags of avarice; Do-Best the highest of all—the expression of life at its noblest in loving sacrifice. The poem ends without life's ideal being realized, the world failing to achieve the goal of Piers' search, but with its last look heavenward in hopeful anticipation that some day the struggle upward toward the Christ would find completion, through Experience, and Patience, and Grace, and Love. As Prof. Henry Morley observes in an admirable paragraph:

"So ends the vision with no victory attained. There is a world at war, and a renewed cry for the grace of God, a new yearning to find Christ and bring with Him the day when wrongs and hatreds are no more. Though in its latest form

somewhat encumbered by reiteration of truths deeply felt, the fourteenth century yielded no more fervent expression of the purest Christian labor to bring men to God. And while the poet dwells on love as the fulfilment of the law—loyal not a lawless love—he is throughout uncompromising in requirement of a life spent in fit labor, a life of Duty. The sin that he makes Pride's companion in leading the assault on Conscience is Sloth. Every man has his work to do, that should be fruit of love to God and to his neighbor. For omitted duties or committed wrongs there is in Langland's system no valid repentance that does not make a man do all he can to repair the omission, right the wrong. Langland lays fast hold on all the words of Christ, and reads them into a divine law of Love and Duty. He is a Church reformer in the truest sense, seeking to strengthen the hands of the clergy by amendment of the lives and characters of those who are untrue to their holy calling. The ideal of a Christian life shines through his poem, while it paints with homely force the evils against which it is directed. On points of theology he never disputes; but an ill life for him is an ill life, whether in Pope or in peasant."

And now what was the value and effect of this curious book in its generation? Perhaps one might reasonably ask also, what is its value that it should merit consideration to-day? In making an estimate of it I cannot overlook, if only in passing reference, the claim to first consideration of its literary form. It is generally and rightly conceded that its literary execution is crude, and yet for all its crudeness there is in it one preëminent quality that makes it historically very important in the development of the English allegory. Without belonging to any school of literary art, being indeed a transition piece, in an age distinguished for its very decided preference for figurative presentation of truth, *Piers Plowman* stands out with extraordinary individuality. Assuming it to be true, as it undoubtedly is, that allegory was the proper and naturally evolved mode of literary expression of the Middle Ages, quite in keeping with their caste of religious and socially feudalistic spirit,

which found parabolic readings in most every object and experience of life, the great body of Medieval English literature can be divided into three classes. First and earliest are the many ponderous, and to us tedious animal epics, which, as Miss Vida Scudder observes in her *Social Ideals in English Letters*, "gathered as unobtrusively as clouds in the medieval air." To this class belong such works as *The Whale*, and *The Panther*, revived from Anglo-Saxon times; the *Bestiary*, of the beginning of the thirteenth century; and *Reynard the Fox*, brought over from Flemish literature about the middle of the twelfth century. To the second class belong the many Goliardic Lyrics and parables, put forth in a combination of French and Latin by the students of the universities, mostly inspired by the lighter Bohemian spirit of academic life. To the third class belong such poems as *The Pearl*, and *Purity*, the *Roman de la Rose*, and *Piers Plowman*, although all of these differ from one another quite as much as four pieces of literature can possibly differ. That which differentiates this last group, however, from the two earlier groups of allegories and makes the group a permanent contribution to the progress of literary art is the distinctly different allegorical method employed. The older allegorical interpretations of scripture, or allegorical stories and natural histories are not to be confused with the very skillful allegorical invention of *Piers Plowman*. It is clear enough that allegories such as *Piers Plowman*, and the *Faerie Queene*, and *Pilgrim's Progress*, have an entirely different effect upon the mind and require a different sort of imagination from that required by the *Bestiary*, or *Reynard the Fox*. In the earlier groups there are always two separate meanings—first the nature of the beast, for instance—the natural history of the lion, the ant, the whale, or the panther; and each one is really only a parable, or applied illustration, its signification coming merely as a parallelism. Although there is a double meaning, there are not two separate meanings presented to the mind one after the other. The signification is given along with and through the characters, events and setting. There is no formal,

mechanical didacticism. "Christian in *Pilgrim's Progress* is not something different and apart from the objective christian man whom he portrays. He is actually that man himself. Mr. Greatheart, without any explanation whatever, is recognized at once as a courageous guide and champion." And the same thing is true with respect to the personages of *Piers Plowman*. It marks a distinct advance on all previous forms of English allegory by the completeness and wholeness of its sustained realism. Starting with a definite story to tell, the process of its movement does not destroy that story to get at its meaning. It simply tells a tale and asks you to accept it along with its allegorical meaning. Its personified abstractions are more than so many applicable illustrations; they are living, pulsating, human beings, living in a concrete world, who carry their own morals and messages without conscious application. And in this fact *Piers Plowman* is literarily of first importance—it is the worthy forerunner of such greater geniuses as Spencer and Bunyan. Perhaps, too, it is in this fact that is to be recognized part of the secret of the poem's popularity, mentioned by all who have written about it. It was a new kind of composition, attractive in its new allegorical dress, comprehensible to the simplest without expository comment, and taken to heart in each individual life without that life's being preached to, by a world of common folk who heretofore had only their recited tales of King Arthur, their traditions of Beowulf, their *Chronicles*, the French romances, the *Owl and the Nightingale*, and nothing of their Bible but the Psalms up to 1380.

But of far more importance than *Piers Plowman's* place in the world of English literary art is its significance as a salutary force in the confused social world of English men and women of the fourteenth century. It was stated at the outset of this paper that above the spiritual salvation of the individual soul this book was concerned chiefly with the social and material welfare of the masses and that in its representation of the practical life-struggle of the middle and lower English classes of its day was the insistent voice of the people crying for just

and reasonable opportunity in the distribution of the benefits and necessities of life. It is in this truth that the full meaning of *Piers Plowman* is to be found.

Contrasting the content and message of Langland with the content and message of Chaucer, Professor Jusserand has well observed that "Chaucer, with his genius and his manifold qualities, his gayety and his gracefulness, his faculty of observation and that apprehensiveness of mind which enables him to sympathise with the most diverse specimens of humanity has drawn as immortal picture of one side of medieval English life." It is Langland who has drawn for us the other side. "We owe to Chaucer's horror of vain abstractions the individuality of each one of his personages. All classes of society are represented in his works." Still he is "the poet of the court," and the types which impersonate his classes are so clearly characterized, their singleness is so marked, that on seeing them, we think of them alone and of no one else. "We are so absorbed in the contemplation of this or that man that we think no more of the class, the ensemble, the nation. The active and actual passions of the multitude, the subterranean lavas which simmer beneath a brittle crust of order and repressing administration, all the latent possibilities of volcanoes, which this inward fire betokens, are, on the contrary, always present to the mind of the visionary Langland. The vehement and passionate England enmasse that produced the great uprising of 1381 and the Lollard movement that emanated from Oxford, which later on gave birth to the Puritans and Cavaliers, is contained in essence in Langland's poem. Without being in contradiction to that vehement and passionate England, Chaucer, nevertheless, screens it, glosses it over, or allows it to be forgotten. At any rate, at the best, he uses it only for the purposes of his art. In their anger Chaucer's people exchange blows on the highways; Langland's crowds in their anger sack the places and take the Tower of London. In a word, Langland shows us what we find in none of his contemporaries; mobs, groups, classes, living and individualized—the merchant class, the religious

class, the seething, motley totality of the general populace." He is preëminently the poet of the crowd, the representative and interpreter of the "field full of folk," the recorder and reader of their struggles and wrongs, not for arts' sake but for reformation. Maintaining throughout the entire poem as its two-fold central theme the reconsecration of the whole church from Pope to humblest worshipper in holiness to spiritual interests alone, and the dignity and primary importance of productive labor as over against the idleness and luxury of wealth and the vagabondage and do-less-ness of poverty, it has been rightly pointed out as the first expression of democracy in English literature. To it has been ascribed much of the questioning mysticism and dissatisfaction arising among the people toward the end of the reign of Edward III and the commencement of the reign of Richard II, the leading features of which were the wide-spread prevalence of socialistic views and the Peasants' Rebellion under John Ball and Wat Tyler. However, while all these things are true predications of the influence of Langland's work, especially its place of power and priority in the early promulgation of more spiritualized ideals in the state; and although, no doubt, the stirring appeals of the *Visions* to popular feeling had some relationship to contemporary political revolt, the emphasis of its temporary effect in these directions tends to obscure its more potent influence as a forceful preparatory element in a much larger, permanent movement in English society in which it was a most important long-distance factor. The real democratic significance of it is to be read only in the events of a generation, perhaps a whole century later. Indeed one cannot well doubt that so far as immediate effects are concerned the puritanical voice of Langland fell upon deaf ears, when one remembers that Lancastrian England rushed headlong into the madness of the fifteenth century with its burning of heretics, its vain and unjust attempts to conquer France, its sacrifice of Joan of Arc, the twenty years of defeat and disgrace that followed and avenged that crime, the fury of its War of the Roses, and its butcheries and

murders. In its last analysis the power of *Piers Plowman* lay not so much in its being the cause of something, as in its being the expression of a deep-seated something already in existence in the national consciousness. To it is due the credit not so much for originating democratic conceptions as for crystallizing them and putting them into articulation in the thought forms of the masses, where they were born. Its true import does not lie in the sporadic and unabiding revolutionary incidents of its immediate generation ascribed to its influence, but in its relationship to a greater movement just beginning to shed its dawning light on the whole continent of Europe and which included in its sweep every interest and activity of current civilization. Although it may be that his face was turned toward the Middle Ages and that he was a creature who lived for the most part in the past, the true significance of Langland lies in his prophetic anticipation of not a few of the ideals of the Renaissance in England as one of its earliest, even if blindly groping pioneers. It was really what he was looking back to in the past, the simplicity and honesty and sincerity and justice of the primitive Christian community, that links him to the future.

Most historians appoint the dates 1400 and 1660 to be the limits of that period of history known as the Renaissance and roughly speaking the dates 350 and 1400 as the limits of the antecedent period known as the Middle Ages. Some extend the Middle Ages well toward the close of the fifteenth century, making the years of 1400 to 1500 a sort of transition period between the two. But after all dates do not adequately mark off historic periods. The true line of cleavage is the mental attitude of men. However exactly either of these divisions may fit the events that transpired among the peoples of continental Europe, the period of transition to the fullness of the Renaissance in England must certainly include those final years of the fourteenth century when John Wycliff, Geoffrey Chaucer, and William Langland looked out with a new mental vision upon their world. Most assuredly these great spirits were the Pil-

grim Fathers of thought in religion, learning, art and social ideals and prepared the ground for the reception of those seeds of truth which have since come to fruition in modern civilization throughout the western hemisphere. Anyhow so far as this statement pertains to *Langland*, if underneath the haziness of his apparent leaning toward medievalism and his rebellion against it, he is not one of the earliest of the moderns, he is not anything. As we understand it to-day the Middle Ages and the Renaissance are not so much two abruptly divided periods of history as they are two opposing and yet naturally related attitudes of men, toward God on the one hand, and toward human life in its manifold relationships and expression, on the other, the later attitude of the Renaissance being a normally evolved reaction against the limitations of a system of thought and social organization that was gradually outgrown by a human order, which by reason of the very potentialities of its endowment can never stand still. If it does so it atrophies and becomes corrupted. The fundamental idea of the Middle Ages was that of the spiritual and the abstract, emphasizing the eternal things of a world to come as alone worth the attention of human endeavor, at the expense of the value of the things of the present, and logically expressing itself, as it did, in the supreme precedence and outward power of a highly organized universal ecclesiastical establishment, a highly centralized state built upon class distinctions that made it an autocratic oligarchy; and a literature, which though incomparably great exemplified at its best in Dante, is still but a portrayal of the world's life in the abstract, with its characters disembodied souls dwelling in the realm of the Elsewhere. The fundamental idea of the Renaissance, on the other hand, without minimizing, when it came to full development, the reality of spiritual things, emphasized the sensuous and the concrete. It set forth at their proper value the essential goodness and inherent possibilities of mortal life as opportunity and means to the achievement of the higher life, and expressed itself ultimately in liberal democratic reorganization of church and state

with attendant recognition of every group and the personal worth of every individual high or low, and his right to the best that he can acquire by untrammelled freedom, honesty and labor; and in a new literature presenting life through characters that are men and women, living and moving in an actual, present, material world. And, however, nebulous and vague it may be, this is the idea that William Langland is feeling after, perhaps all unconsciously in *The Vision of Piers the Plowman*.

This is the idea he found surging up, and, it may be, not understood, in the awakening consciousness of his field full of folk. If his visions were upward toward the heavens, it was because they were lifted thither from a seemingly hopeless order of earthly things that needed readjustment, the power for which he knew not whence was coming except it came from God; an order in which men had forgotten to be true and just, in which religion had forgotten its divine foundations and that one of its functions was to teach men the benevolent administration of material things on the principle of love. To Langland, if heaven was to be desired, life was still worthy and good, and all of its benefits and privileges for all. This, I say is the larger democracy of *Piers Plowman*. That he did not see of the travail of his soul, and that he was dissatisfied the end of his poem testifies, but surely if he can look down from some more perfect realm upon this still confused world of 1920, he will know that, although forgotten by most, his visions and his hopes and his prayers were not in vain.

LANCASTER, PA.

IV.

PRIESTHOOD THEN AND NOW.

LESTER REDDIN.

Perhaps the best definition of religion that has been formulated in recent years is that given by the late Professor William James in his *Varieties of Religious Experience*. The noted Harvard professor defines religion as "That set of feelings, acts, and experiences which we have in our solitude in the presence of what we consider to be divine." This definition postulates the three fundamental ideas that underlie all religions: first, some sort of idea of the divine; second, the divine has to do with the lives of men; third, there is a corresponding necessity that men sustain the proper attitude toward the divine. Another well nigh universal conviction is that of a chasm between man and the divine which can be bridged only through the office of a mediator. The mediator, or priest, chosen from among his fellows must be acceptable to the deity. Accordingly, with few exceptions, an established priesthood is a phenomenon common to all religions, ancient and modern. There are striking diversities, as to details, among the priesthoods of the various religions of the world, but their constant is the idea of mediation between men and the gods. The prevalence of such belief and custom among peoples of all races and climes and in various periods of the history of religion raises the presumption of an actual human need of a recognized advocate with God, and the revelation which the true God has given is to the effect that such necessity exists in the divine economy as it relates to human salvation.

In the Pre-Sinaitic period of Biblical history there existed a miscellaneous priesthood; *i. e.*, there was no organized priesthood, but the priestly functions were performed by the father

on behalf of the family (Gen. 8:20), by the leader of a band on behalf of his followers (*Ibid.* 12:7-8), by Melchizedek, the priest-king, on behalf of his people (*Ibid.* 14:18), and perhaps by many another "priest of the most high God" who, like this prototype of the Great High Priest, derived his priesthood from no predecessor and delivered it to no successor. The covenant established by Jehovah through Moses had "ordinances of worship and its sanctuary," and a regularly ordained priesthood. To this priesthood belonged certain privileges and prerogatives which a "stranger" dared not assume (Lev. 3:10; 18:7). Only the priests could offer sacrifices (Lev. 1:9-12, 15-17; Ex. 30:20) and burn incense (Ex. 30:7ff; Num. 16:40) before Jehovah, or even come within the altar inclosure (Num. 18:7). To the priests was committed the care of the table of the shewbread (Lev. 24:8), and they alone might lawfully partake thereof (Ex. 29:32; Lev. 8:31; cf. Matt. 12:4). The priest alone might pronounce the benediction on the people (Num. 6:22). They had to guard the distinction between the sacred and the profane, between the clean and the unclean (Lev. 10:10), and pronounce upon the presence and cure of leprosy (Lev. 13).

The attitude of Christ toward the Temple and its priesthood may be defined as that of a loyal Jew. To him the Temple was the house of his Father (Jn. 2:16); to be in company with those in attendance there was to be "among those of his Father" *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου*, Lk. 2:49). He made no apology for exercising his divine prerogative in healing lepers and thus restoring them to their places in their families and in society, but, as soon as they were healed, he commanded them to go and show themselves to the priests and there offer the gifts which Moses commanded (Matt., 8:4; Mk. 1:44; Lk. 5:14, 17:14). He assumed that his disciples would habitually bring gifts to the altar, and only admonished them to be reconciled to the offended brother before such gifts were offered (Matt. 5:23, 24). But he lived in a period of transition when the old regime had already become

antiquated and the new was about to be ushered in. And, notwithstanding his loyalty to the old, we find frequent allusions in his teaching to the near approach of the new and its pre-eminence over the old. In his conversation with the Samaritan woman concerning the superiority of the claims of the Jerusalem temple over those of the Samaritan temple, he asserts that the hour has come when both Moriah and Gerizim must relinquish their claims to peculiar sanctity, for the necessity for temple worship is about to be done away with; a new and better way of approach unto God is about to be opened up. Also in the words of institution of his memorial supper. "This is my blood of the New Covenant," he makes the former Covenant old (cf. Heb. 8:13), and implies that the New is about to be sealed with his own blood. In his commission to those who were to be ministers of the New Covenant, he commands them to cast out unclean spirits, to heal diseases, to preach the gospel, and to baptize in the name of the Trinity, but nowhere does he bestow upon them any distinctive priestly prerogative. When, under the guidance of the Spirit of truth, his apostles entered upon that work to which he had appointed them, there is no indication, either from their words or actions, that they understood any priestly prerogative to belong to them by virtue of their apostolic office.

But the New Testament makes distinct recognition of a priesthood belonging to the new economy. Christianity has been defined as "Theism plus Mediation."¹ Christ is the "High Priest of our profession." Although it is only in the Epistle to the Hebrews that the word priest (*ιερεύς*) is applied to Christ, other New Testament writers express the same idea in different terminology. To John he is our "advocate (*παράκλητος*) with the Father" (1 Jn. 2:1); to Paul he is the "one Mediator (*μεσίτης*) between God and men" (1 Tim. 2:5), the one through whom the world is reconciled unto God (2 Cor. 5:19; cf. Eph. 2:16), the one who "maketh intercession for us" at the right hand of God (Rom. 8:34). The author of

¹ See Adeney, article "Mediation" in *Hastings' D. B.*

Hebrews takes up the subject of Christ's priesthood and works it out in all its implications. Indeed, this is the leading idea in the doctrinal portion of his epistle. Moses, Aaron, and Melchizedek are introduced only to show the personal excellency of the Son and his preëminence in office. The following points of superiority in the priesthood of Christ are emphasized by our author:

1. *The Manner of His Appointment.*—He did not inherit his priesthood by virtue of his tribal connection as did the sons of Levi, for "it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priesthood" (7:1), but he who confers appointments to position in his kingdom on the basis of fitness (cf. Matt. 20:21-23), appointed his Son as priest after the order of Melchizedek. Aaron and his sons were inducted into office according to a prescribed ritual, but Christ was made priest by the oath of him who said: "The Lord sware and will not repent, 'Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek,'" (7:21).

2. *The Perpetuity of His Office.*—The Aaronic priests "were forbidden by death to continue, but he, because he abides forever, has his priesthood inalienable" (7:23, 24). This perpetuity in office is the guarantee of ultimate salvation to all those who come to God through him, "since he ever lives to intercede for them."

3. *The Nature of His Sacrifice.*—"Every high priest is appointed to offer both gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is necessary that this one also have something which he may offer" (8:3). The Aaronic priests were continually offering sacrifices "unable to perfect the worshiper as to the conscience" (9:9, 10:1-), but serving rather as a reminder of sin. "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins" (9:22), but this blood must be more efficacious than the blood of bulls and goats which can never take away sins (10:4). Christ as high priest, being under necessity of offering a sacrifice, and that one which could take away sin, made an offering of himself (7:27), without blemish to God (9:14), entering

"through the greater and more perfect tabernacle through his own blood . . . obtaining eternal redemption" (9:11, 12).

The interpretation of the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin is not peculiar to this epistle, but it is found imbedded in each of the three important types of apostolic teaching; namely, the Pauline, the Petrine, and the Johannine. According to Paul (Eph. 5:2) Christ gave himself as an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odor of sweet smell; according to Peter (1 P. 1:18, 19) he is the [sacrificial] "lamb without blemish and without spot" whose blood rather than silver and gold redeems from sin (cf. 3:18); according to John it is the blood of Christ that cleanses from all sins (1 Jn. 1:7).

4. *The Finality of His Sacrifice.*—The incomparable worth of such a sacrifice eliminates the necessity of a repetition of the offering. "But now once for all at the end of the ages, he has been manifested to put away sin through the sacrifice of himself" (9:26). This furthermore denies the possibility of a "continuation" or an "extension" of the sacrifice of Christ through consecrated bread and wine.

But the sacrificial is not the only aspect of Christ's priestly work. Equally important is his work of intercession. He has entered into Heaven itself "to appear in the presence of God for us" (Heb. 9:24; cf. Rom. 8:34; 1 Jn. 2:1), where he ever lives to intercede for his people. No more than his sacrifice does his intercession need to be supplemented by the office of another. He is the one Mediator between God and men. There is, therefore, no necessity for a "Blessed Virgin" to make intercession before the Heavenly Father on behalf of her spiritual children, or for glorified saints to intercede for the saints on earth, or for a human priest to stand before the altar to present the cause of his people before a God who could not be approached by his believing children without such mediation. It may be that the Scripture language does not demand, possibly does not warrant, the inference that Christ stands incessantly making petitions for his saints all and each, or endorsing to the Heavenly Father the various prayers which are

incessantly offered in his name, or perpetually calling to the Father's notice the sacrifice which he made once for all on Calvary, yet his intercession is equivalent to all this. But the foregoing does not exhaust the New Testament teaching concerning priesthood. The doctrine of the priesthood of all believers which was guaranteed a place in Protestant theology by the emphasis placed upon it by the Reformers, especially Martin Luther, far antedates the Reformation. It is clearly a New Testament teaching. Although it is hinted at elsewhere in the New Testament, it is only in the Petrine epistles, *i. e.*, 1 Peter and Hebrews,² that the doctrine is clearly enunciated. "Ye yourselves also, as living stones, are being built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (1 Peter, 2:5). "Through him, therefore, let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips that give thanks to his name. But to do good and to distribute forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased" (Heb. 13:15, 16). In Romans 12:1 Paul speaks of one's "rational service" as "a living sacrifice," but the verb of presentation (*παρίστημι*) which he uses in this connection is never used, either in the Septuagint or in the New Testament, of a priestly act. In the Book of Revelation (1:6; 5:10; 20:6) believers are called "priests unto God," but their specific functions as such are not there defined. It is noteworthy then that this glorious doctrine of an universal priesthood of believers should have first been promulgated by him who is reputed to be the ancestral head of that organized hierarchy which to-day claims authority to grant absolution from sin, to excommunicate from the church, and, consequently, from Heaven, to deliver souls from purgatory, to change bread and wine into the veritable body and blood of Christ, and through the mass to make a continuation of the sacrifice of Christ.

² It is the opinion of the present writer that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written by the Apostle Peter. It does not fall within the scope of this paper, however, to give the arguments in favor of this view, but they will be found fully stated in an article, "Hebrew a Petrine Document," published in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, October, 1911.

But whence arises the necessity of such a priesthood? If perfection is brought about by one priesthood, what necessity is there that another should arise? (cf. Heb. 7:11). If Christ's self-sacrifice was the final offering for sin, and he is the only Mediator between God and men, what need is there for a priesthood of believers? These questions can best be answered by first considering on whose behalf the priest-believer exercises his unique office, and what is the nature of his priestly service. If all believers are alike priests unto God, it seems superfluous that one believer should exercise his office on behalf of others who are priests equally with himself. It is true that prayer is recognized as a means of securing blessing when offered by Christians on behalf of their brethren (1 Thes. 5:25; 2 Thes. 3:1; James 5:16), but this is quite different from the idea involved in the priesthood of believers. On the other hand, if Christians are of "royal priesthood" mediating between God and the unbelieving world, then Christ is no longer the only Mediator between God and men. It appears, then, that each believer is a priest unto God on his own behalf; and just as there are seen to be two aspects of the priestly work of Christ—the sacrificial and the intercessory—there may be said to be two aspects of the believer's priesthood—the aspect of privilege and the aspect of duty. When viewed in its aspect of privilege the believer's priesthood involves the right to come "boldly" and with "a true heart in fulness of faith," through the "new and living way" which Christ "instituted for us" by his own blood to the throne of grace that we may receive mercy and find grace for well-timed help (Heb. 5:16; 10:19-22). When viewed in its aspect of duty it involves the offering up of "spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ"; not sacrifices for sin, but the sacrifices of daily service.

Of the various schemes of classification of the Old Testament sacrifices as satisfactory as any would be the following:

1. The whole burnt offering of entire self-dedication.
2. The sin offering (described in Lev. 6:24ff) and trespass (Lev. 7:1-10) or guilt offering.

3. Peace offering (Lev. 7:11), including the thank-offerings, votive offerings, and free-will offerings. The sacrifices of Christian service are most analogous to this third class. The sin offering took logical precedence over the other two classes, as no one could offer a burnt-offering or a peace-offering until he had purged himself from sin by the sin offering. In like manner the individual must first appropriate the benefits of the one sacrifice for sin made by our great High Priest on Calvary before he can offer "spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." The apostle in defining the spiritual sacrifices speaks first of the "sacrifice of praise," which is "the fruit of lips that give thanks to his name" (Heb. 13:15). Surely this "fruit of lips" comprehends far more than the songs of praise which the Christian is admonished to sing (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16; Jas. 5:13). Does it not include *all* the service which we may render with the lips, our words of testimony concerning God's holiness and love which we address to our fellow-men, as well as our words of praise and thanksgiving directed to the Heavenly Father himself? The apostle furthermore speaks of our duty to our fellow-man, *i. e.*, doing good and distributing (Heb., 13:16), as sacrifices with which God is well pleased. So, then, we may conclude with Forsyth that "the whole sphere of Christian action is a spiritual sacrifice."

MILTON, PA.

V.

THE NEW TESTAMENT CATALOGUES OF THE APOSTLES.

WM. WEBER.

Careful observers are bound to notice that the historical writings of the New Testament in their present form do not belong to the beginning but to the end of the apostolic age. They are not the first attempts to fix in writing the life and deeds of Jesus and his apostles. They represent rather the final result of that process. The evangelists have collected the older written material, as far as it was accessible to them. They have arranged it according to their judgment or lack of judgment and have thus saved for posterity a considerable amount of first-hand information about our Savior, a golden treasure in earthen vessels, as St. Paul has it. The evangelists have done their work each one for himself. Whatever of similarity exists among the synoptic Gospels is due, not to any direct dependence of the one upon the other, but to the fact that they made use of similar sources.

The composition of the Gospels and the Acts is indeed much more complicated and points to a much longer period of evolution than is generally admitted. But any thorough examination of any passage, as, *e. g.*, of the four catalogues of the apostles which are found in Matthews, Mark, Luke, and Acts, will demonstrate the fact. Those catalogues have comparatively little importance as historical sources. For most of the names contained in them are nothing but names of empty sound. But in as far as they illustrate the gradual growth of the historical books of the New Testament, they cannot be valued too highly. They are found in Mt. 10, 2-4; Mk. 3, 16-19; Lk. 6, 14-16; Acts 1, 13.

The first question to be asked in all these cases is: Do these catalogues form an organic whole with their context, or do they interrupt the original current of thought and are they inserted in a purely mechanical way from some other source into our text?

Mt. 10, 2-4, the twelve intimate disciples of Jesus are called *apostles*. That is strange. We know of course well enough who the twelve apostles are. We imagine that name to be the honorary title which Jesus bestowed upon his official representatives and envoys in order to distinguish them from the great mass of his disciples. But the first evangelist did not know *The Twelve* under that appellation. He speaks of them as *The Twelve Disciples*, (*Mt. 10, 1; 11, 1; 20, 7; 26, 20*). He calls them twice (*Mt. 26, 14* and *47*) simply *The Twelve*. He includes them more than sixty times in the general term *The Disciples*. But the noun *apostle* occurs in the entire first gospel only *Mt. 10, 2*. That is the more to be remarked, as we find immediately before, in *Mt. 10, 1*, the term *The Twelve Disciples*. The text does not indicate in the least that this change of expression has any meaning and is therefore justified on logical grounds.

It would be quite different, if *Mt. 10, 2-4*, followed after *Mt. 10, 5*, instead of standing before that verse. For then the noun *ἀπόστολος* would clearly be an echo of the preceding verb *ἀπέστειλεν*. Immediately after *Mt. 10, 1* the twelve disciples are not yet the apostles, while after *Mt. 10, 5* they have a right to that name.

The awkward position of *Mt. 10, 2-4* and the word *ἀπόστολος* which does not belong to the vocabulary of the first evangelist show that the passage is a later insertion into our text. Matthew possessed together with other written material a catalogue of the twelve apostles. He desired to embody it into his book and considered the place where he put it as the most appropriate.

The truth is so evident that even conservative English scholars have pointed to the real character of our catalogue.

Tregelles as well as Westcott and Hort have separated in their text-editions of the New Testament Mt. 10, 2-4 from the context. Tregelles makes it a paragraph by itself. Westcott and Hort mark it off by open spaces at the beginning and the end of the passage. W. C. Allen, *Internat. Crit. Com. St. Matthew*, 1907, p. 99, states expressly: "The editor thought that this would be a suitable place for the insertion of the names of the apostles. He tells us furthermore, p. 100, of τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστιν ταῦτα: "This is an editorial introduction."

Since the insertion of Mt. 10, 2-4 rendered necessary certain changes in verse 5, we may restore the original text of Mt. 10, 1-5 as follows: "And after he had summoned his twelve disciples, he gave them authority over unclean spirits, to cast them out and to heal all manner of disease and all manner of sickness, and sent them forth, after charging them as follows." We cannot decide here whether that is the original introduction of Mt. 10, 5b-41. One thing is sure. Mt. 10, 1 does not continue Mt. 9, 37-38. That is excluded by the phrase τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ Mt. 9, 37 as over against τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ Mt. 10, 1. Moreover the verb προσκαλούμενος Mt. 10, 1 testifies against such a supposition. According to the last verses of the preceding chapter Jesus is talking with his disciples. That presupposes their presence with him. Therefore he need not summon the twelve disciples. He might have taken them aside.

The catalogue Mk. 3, 16-19 stands even more alone than that in Mt. The Revised Version reads: "and Simon he surnamed Peter." A footnote remarks indeed: "Some ancient authorities insert *and he appointed twelve*." As a matter of fact, those ancient authorities have *The Twelve* with the definite article. Tischendorf as well as Westcott and Hort have adopted this reading with B C* Aeth.m. and *. But Tregelles, who could not use the Cod. Sinaiticus for Mk., has omitted it with A C²D P L. rel. Latt. Syrr. Pst. and Hel. Memph. Goth. Arm. Aeth. ed.

If we could follow Tregelles and the translators, ancient and modern, the case would be quite simple. There would not exist the least connection between the catalogue and the preceding statement, and we might state confidently that our passage does not belong to the original text. Q.E.D.

Still that conclusion would not remove the difficulties presented by our passage. One could not overlook that the introductory words *καὶ ἐπὶ ἐθῆκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι* refer exclusively to the first name *Πέτρον*. All the other names would hover in the air. They are in the accusative case and demand a transitive verb whose direct object they are. That is the main reason why *καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα* recommends itself as a necessary constituent of the otherwise incomplete sentence. We thus are compelled to recognize in these words the real beginning of Mk. 3, 16-19. But what could induce the evangelist to repeat in this place words which he had used only shortly before? Verse 14 he writes: *καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα*. One should expect to find the names of the Twelve immediately after this statement. That would have been its logical position. One may indeed claim that the author wished to avoid too long a sentence. But even then there was nothing to compel him that he should open verse 16 by a phrase he had employed shortly before. He might, *e. g.*, have said: *The names of these twelve are.*

It is the clumsiness and stiffness of the clause *καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα* that has induced the translators of ancient and modern times to leave out these words, even while knowing how well they are attested.

The solution of the riddle will be found, if we assume that Mk. 3, 16-19 represents a written source independent from its present context. The editor who is responsible for its appearance in our text prefaced the catalogue with *καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα*. He had to connect the passage in some way with what we read in verse 13-15 and borrowed for that purpose the ready-made clause of verse 14.

This conclusion is confirmed by several observations. We are going to learn that the catalogue in Mk. is a Peter-cata-

logue. For of the four, two may be called Peter- and two Simon-catalogues. But the first of the disciples is called in Mk. up to Mk. 3, 16 exclusively, and that five times, Simon. Secondly Mk. 1, 16 and 29 Simon and Andrew are mentioned together as a pair of brothers. In our catalogue Peter occupies the first and Andrew the fourth place, and no mention is made of their kinship. A third indication that Mk. 3, 16-19 belongs to a source not yet copied from in the first chapters of Mk. is to be seen in the fact that Mk. 2, 14 the son of Alphæus whom Jesus invites to become his disciple bears the name of Levi, whereas he is called in the catalogue James. That divergence cannot be explained away by stating that Mk. 2, 14 refers to discipleship in general, while Mk. 3, 16-19 treats of the special class of disciples called apostles. Our Lord summons Levi (Mk. 2, 14), ἀκαλούθει μοι. The publican accepts that call. Mk. 3, 14 the first task of the apostles is defined ἵνα ὠσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ. That signifies evidently one and the same thing.

We may therefore state with a good measure of assurance that Mk. 3, 16-19 represents a new source from which the evangelist has not yet copied anything in the preceding part of the gospel. Neither is the catalogue continued after verse 19. For there does not exist any grammatical or logical connection between Mk. 3, 16-19 and Mk. 2, 20 ff. Not before Mk. 6, 7-13, from which 6, 30 must not be separated, do we come to a passage that is related to the catalogue. But it is rather a parallel account than the sequence of the catalogue.

Thus we cannot escape from the conclusion: The evangelist must have been in possession of a written list of the twelve most intimate disciples which was altogether independent of the rest of his material. That list of names he saw fit to insert where it now appears. The examination of Mt. 10, 2-4 led us to a similar result.

Lk. 6, 14-16 hands down the names of the twelve disciples whom Jesus is said to have picked out at a certain occasion from the whole number of his followers (Lk. 6, 13). The pur-

pose of that selection is not explained in either Lk. 6, 14-16 or anywhere else. The words *οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν* (6, 13) can hardly supply that want. Neither the term *apostle* is as yet appropriate. The Twelve are indeed called apostles in Lk. 9, 10 which continues Lk. 9, 1-6. But there the noun is not so much the official title which Jesus bestowed upon them but the class name which denotes their just reported activity as messengers, or envoys of Jesus. It is more than doubtful whether Jesus ever applied the appellation *apostles* to his twelve disciples in the present ecclesiastical sense of that word. Matthew, Mark and John bear decidedly witness against it. It looks therefore, as if *οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν* were a later addition to the original text. It may very well be due to the hand of Luke himself. For he is the only evangelist that employs the term *apostle* as a title. Cp. Lk. 22, 14; 24, 10.

After dropping the relative clause "whom also he named apostles" the connection of the second half of verse 13 with 14-16 offers no special difficulties. Still, after what we learned about the first two synoptists, it does not seem very probable that verse 13b and the catalogue formed originally a whole. The participle-construction *καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος*, etc., is more than awkward and renders the sentence beginning with verse 13 uncommonly long. It would have been much simpler to write *καὶ ἐξελέξατο*. Moreover the *δώδεκα* does not agree very well with the catalogue. Since the names of the Twelve are given, the definite article would be in order before the word meaning twelve. Or the author might have enumerated the twelve names, leaving it to the reader to count them. His text would then read: "And he chose from them Simon," etc. Or he might have begun the sentence immediately after the catalogue with the words: *These Twelve*. Such difficulties render it not unlikely that the Luke catalogue of the apostles does just as little belong to its present context as the corresponding catalogues in Matthew and Mark.

That there is no connection between verse 14-16 and verse 17 ff. goes without saying. We hear no more of the Twelve but

of all the disciples. The Luke version of the Sermon on the Mount which commences 6, 20 is addressed just as that of Matthew to all disciples and not to the apostles alone. Lk. 6, 20 reads: *εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν*; and Mt. 5, 1 we find the statement: *προσῆλθαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων*. As far as Lk. 6, 17 ff. is concerned, the Luke catalogue is entirely isolated.

The participle *καταβὰς* (verse 17) tempts one to join Luke 6, 17 directly to Luke 6, 13a. Then the original text would have read: *καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡμέρα προσεφώνησεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπον πεδινῷ*. That would be the old introduction to the Sermon on the Mount. It would likewise help us to understand why Jesus passed the night in prayer on the mountain. Jesus was preparing his great sermon. The choice of the Twelve has hardly been the fruit of a single prayer. Luke, not less than the other Synop- tists, relates how Jesus chose the Twelve, not from the whole body of his adherents, but invited them individually, just as the chance of doing so was offered. Cp. Lk. 5, 1-11 and 27-28.

Accepting this solution, one has to consider the second half of verse 13 as an editorial addition. That would isolate the catalogue in front as well as in the rear. The following observations will confirm this impression. First Luke employs repeatedly in his editorial additions a participle of the aorist medii. Cp. Lk. 7, 18, *προσκαλεσάμενος*; Lk. 9, 1, *συνκαλεσάμενος*; Acts 1, 1, *ἐντειλάμενος*. Secondly, the catalogue opens with the words: "Simon whom he also named Peter." That is a strange expression for Luke. He calls the first disciple (Lk. 5, 8) *Simon Peter*. He is usually mentioned as *Peter*. In three instances his name is *Simon*. Thirdly, the catalogue brings Andrew in the second place and tells us that he was the brother of Simon Peter. But the more explicit account of the calling of Peter, James, and John (Lk. 5, 1-11) does not speak of Andrew, whose name occurs nowhere in Luke except in our catalogue. Fourthly, the name of Levi of whose call Lk. 5, 27 ff. treats does not appear in the catalogue.

The fourth catalogue which we find Acts 1, 13 differs in two respects from the three synoptic catalogues. It is not identical with any of them, not even with that of Luke. Moreover it contains only eleven names.

That it differs from Lk. 6, 14-16 proves without doubt that Luke has made use of a separate written list of names for Acts 1, 13. The many and characteristic dissimilarities admit of no other explanation. The verb ἐξελέξατο (Acts 1, 2) shows that the evangelist still remembered Lk. 6, 13 where he has the same verb. If therefore he had entertained the least uncertainty as to the names of the twelve apostles or their order, he would have turned to the catalogue in his gospel and copied it. The dissimilarities can neither be regarded as errors of memory. We shall yet see that the four catalogues agree pairwise in the first and pairwise in the last six names.

The second peculiarity of Acts 1, 13 that only eleven names are quoted appears at the first glance as something quite natural. The twelfth apostle had deserted them and was according to Acts 1, 18 f. already dead at that time. But since it has been ascertained that Acts 1, 13 has been derived from a written source, the number eleven indicates something more. In the first place, that catalogue cannot have contained the name of Matthias, the successor of the traitor. For in that case Luke would have inserted our list into his account of the election of Matthias in the second half of chapter 1. But during the few weeks which elapsed between the death of Jesus and the day of Pentecost nobody can have felt the desire of preserving a list of the eleven most prominent disciples. At that time far more important questions interested the followers of Jesus. Their very existence as believers in the Christ was at stake. When later on, after the cause of Jesus had proved victorious, the historical interest awoke, people naturally began to inquire who the twelve apostles were that Jesus had chosen, and who hath filled the position left vacant by Judas Iscariot. For that reason, a list which did not have the name of Matthias must have contained originally the name of the traitor. That

name Luke of course dropped when he inserted his second catalogue into the first chapter of Acts.

We now have to examine in what relation Acts 1, 13 stands to its context. It is quite sure that in the very first verses of Acts different sources make their appearance. The first sentences belong without doubt to Luke himself. Towards the end of verse 4 the indirect discourse for which the editor is to be held responsible changes suddenly into direct discourse. That is an indication that there a written source begins which Luke has prefaced with an introduction from his own pen. Under these circumstances the subject of Acts 1, 5-12 is not necessarily *the apostles*, as now seems to follow from Acts 1, 2-4.

Luke himself undoubtedly thought so. Nevertheless many reasons contradict his supposition. In the first place, we have to raise the question: Why should Jesus have invited only the apostles to become witnesses of his ascension? According to Acts 1, 15 there were at that time about 120 of his adherents at Jerusalem. Did the apostles perhaps hold even that early a position superior to that of the whole body of the disciples so that they were favored with special revelations? Jesus has certainly given special orders and instructions to the Twelve whenever he deemed that advisable or necessary, *e. g.*, when he sent them forth on their missionary expedition. But such instruction and information concerned only those apostles; and moreover it is doubtful whether at that occasion he had any other disciples in his company. Not all who believe in him were enabled to leave their homes and families and work in order to follow Jesus and to prepare for the ministry of the kingdom of heaven. The questions actually discussed at the ascension were such as concerned not the apostles only but the whole body of believers in an equal measure. Jesus replies to a question about the time of the final coming of his kingdom and speaks about the baptism with the Holy Spirit. The latter promise is repeated twice. Acts 1, 5 and 9. When Peter quotes the prophecy of Joel in order to explain the Pentecost event (Acts 2, 16-21) that implies that all the disciples, including

women and children had received the Holy Spirit. Likewise all the other references to such spiritual baptisms in the Acts confirm that the Holy Spirit was not a gift reserved for a special and limited number of Christians, but that it was bestowed upon all believers without distinction of age or sex or ecclesiastical rank. It is superfluous to tell that all followers of Christ were equally interested in the coming of his kingdom, because all hoped and had been promised to enter therein.

Secondly, the term *οἱ συνελθόντες* (Acts 1, 6) does not imply exactly that only eleven persons are meant. Verse 8, those that had come together are told indeed to become witnesses of Jesus throughout the whole world. But all disciples were entitled and in duty bound to bear witness of Jesus, if they possibly could do so. Whoever possessed the gift of testimony had to employ his talent without waiting till somebody would instal him officially as a witness. The Acts contain many references to this fact. Stephen had been ordained to take care of the poor hellenistic widows. That did not prevent him from discussing in the Greek synagogues his Christian convictions. St. Paul, the founder of the Church of the Gentiles, is the most prominent example and proof that in the early church the spiritual gift, not any official call, was considered the seal and pledge of the right and duty of preaching the gospel.

The word *πάντες* (1, 14) points in the same direction. It seems to apply to *all* Christians who at that time were at Jerusalem. If only the comparatively small number of eleven were meant, the author would in all probability have used the word *ἐνδεκα* not *πάντες*.

Fourthly, the expression *ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν τῇ προσευχῇ* refers certainly to the entire Christian community. Why should the author mention the unanimity and prayerfulness of the Eleven? It is not so much a cause for wonder and admiration that a small number but that a large body of people are of one mind and are animated by the same hopes and the same enthusiasm. Acts 2, 46 where the same phrase *καθ' ἡμέραν προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ* is found includes expressly *all believers* (2, 43).

Fifthly, women as well as Mary and the brothers of Jesus are mentioned in verse 14 as having been together with the *πάντες* of the same sentence. That also points not to the Eleven but to all the disciples. The phrase *σὺν γυναῖξιν* offers indeed certain difficulties. But the absence of the definite article makes it impossible to think only of the wives of the Eleven. But that all the women who believed in Jesus should have formed together with the Eleven a separate community, instead of living with the whole body of Christians, that is to say, with their own families, appears improbable. The same conclusion is to be drawn from the fact that the mother and brothers of Jesus are spoken of.

Sixthly, the parallel account of Lk. 24, 33-52 has to be compared. According to that, all the disciples, *the apostles and those σὺν αὐτοῖς*—the two Emmaus-disciples belong to the second category—were present at the ascension and were commanded to become witnesses of Jesus.

Lastly, the position where the catalogue of the apostles stands in Luke has to be taken into account. It is not found till towards the end of the whole passage. We look for that catalogue right at the beginning in verse 2. In any case, it would be much better, if it were given in verse 6 instead of the general term *οἱ συνελθόντες* or, at least, at the beginning of verse 12. It is altogether uncommon that in such a longer section the subject should be introduced, not towards the end of the first sentence, but near the end of the whole passage.

For all these reasons, we are compelled to assume that the catalogue of Acts 1, 13 has been inserted into our text from the copy of a separate written list which Luke had obtained in some way and that in quite as mechanical and unskillful a manner as the same thing has been done in the three synoptic gospels.

After having ascertained the true character of the four catalogues we turn to the next question whether the three gospels—the Acts do not concern us here—are dependent upon one another in the choice of the place where the catalogues have been inserted.

Matthew has located his catalogue at the head of the section which hands down the instructions that Jesus gave to his disciples when they were about to start on their first missionary journey. One has to admit that this place is very appropriate. If the seams which join Mt. 10, 2-4 to its context were not too rough, nobody could doubt but that the list of the twelve names stands where it ought to stand.

One cannot say that much of Mk. 3, 16-19. The sending forth of the Twelve is related in the second gospel Mk. 6, 7 ff. Mk. 3, 20 ff. treats among other things of the Beelzebub episode and the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost and has nothing to do with the apostles as such. Nor are the passages which precede the catalogues of the apostles in Matthew and Mark related to each other. Consequently, the two gospels are in this respect entirely independent of each other. If Matthew should have used a copy of Mark while he was composing his gospel, he refused purposely and consciously to follow its lead in this case. If on the other hand Mark should have had a copy of Matthew, he would have inserted his catalogue in the section beginning with Mk. 6, 7. It is hard to see any reason and justification for the choice he actually made.

Luke 6, 14-16 stands, as we have noticed, in the introduction of the Lucan version of the Sermon on the Mount. That shows that the third evangelist was ignorant of the arrangement preferred by Matthew. He might have inserted his catalogue quite as well Lk. 9, 1. It further demonstrates that Luke did not imitate Mark. It is said indeed the phrase *εἰς τὸ ὄρος*, Lk. 6, 21, shows that the third evangelist follows in the wake of the second. For the same phrase is found in Mk. 3, 13. But it is rather risky to deduct so strong a conclusion from a phrase which occurs not only in this single instance but in quite a number of passages in all gospels. Cp. Mt. 5, 1; 14, 23; 15, 29; 23, 16; Mk. 6, 47; Lk. 9, 28; Jn. 6, 3. Moreover, what is to assure us that Mark is not dependent upon Luke? But since we have learned that Lk. 6, 12 ff. introduces the Sermon on the Mount, it is much more reasonable to look to Mt. 5, 1 as

a parallel of Lk. 6, 12. The phrase under discussion εἰς τὸ ὄρος is used also in these two instances. If we ask whether Lk. betrays any judgment in his choice of the passage where he has inserted his catalogue, the answer is bound to be affirmative. The Sermon on the Mount is addressed not to the public at large but to the disciples. (Cp. Mt. 5, 1-2, and Lk. 6, 20; 6, 13a; 6, 17. It embodies the principal teachings of Jesus, the new law. Before Jesus could undertake to import his new commandments to his disciples, he must have secured them. Luke's catalogue of the Twelve therefore implies that these men were the first disciples who followed Jesus and who listened to his teachings.

It cannot be doubted that each evangelist picked out the passage in which he inserted his catalogue of the apostles absolutely in accordance with his own liking and judgment.

It remains to examine carefully the four catalogues themselves and to compare them with each other.

In Matthew we observe first of all the agreement between Mt. 10, 2 and 4, 18-22. In both instances the first disciple is called Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος. The second disciple is both times Andrew the brother of Simon. James the son of Zebedee occupies the third place, and his brother John the fourth. This agreement is the more remarkable as the term *Simon the so-called Peter* is found nowhere else in the New Testament. The name usually applied to the first disciple in Matthew is *Peter*. He is named in all twenty-five times in the first gospel. (Cp. Moulton & Geden, Concordance to the Greek Testament.) Twenty times out of these twenty-five his name is *Peter*, once *Simon Peter* (Mt. 16, 16), once simply *Simon* (17, 25), and once *Simon Bar-Jonah* (16, 17).

According to Mt. 16, 18 one might imagine that Jesus gave Simon the surname of Peter in answer to his famous confession "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God!" We should thus expect to find the apostle called in Matthew before that confession *Simon* and afterwards *Peter*, or *Simon Peter*. In reality he bears even before his confession not less than four

times the name of *Peter*. (Cp. Mt. 8, 14; 14, 28, 29; 15, 15.) The name *Simon* is used only once and that after the confession.

The two names *Simon* and *Peter* point evidently to two different written sources which Matthew has incorporated into his gospel. If that is true, the phrase *ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος* cannot belong to the original text of Mt. 4, 18 and 10, 2. Whoever made that addition had observed that the usual name of the apostle is Peter, not Simon. He knew a number of individuals by the latter name. In order to spare the readers any perplexity, he deemed it necessary to make his explanatory addition. If we desire to determine who is to be held responsible for it, we have to reckon with three possibilities. The addition is either due to the hand of the composer of the gospel, or he adopted it as an integral part of his source, or it was inserted sooner or later after the gospel had been published in its present form. In Mt. 4, 18, neither the composer nor a later reader or copier could have any special reason why he should insert the phrase. The disciple is mentioned for the first time. Nobody has felt compelled to add a similar note to Mk. 1, 16 and Lk. 5, 3. It stands to reason that in Mt. 8, 14 either the editor or a later glossator should have judged it desirable to call attention to the identity of Peter and the afore-mentioned Simon. We thus have hardly any choice left and must decide that *ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος*, although clearly a gloss, was extant in the text, as Matthew found it.

The words *ὁ καὶ παραδοὺς αὐτόν* represent another later addition. The aorist participle proves that the man who wrote these words did not think of the situation, as it presents itself in Mt. 10, 1 ff. At that time Judas Iscariot had not yet betrayed his master, and nobody could then suspect that he should prove a traitor. If one desires to see how a narrator who relates what he has seen and what he remembers himself speaks of Judas Iscariot, one should compare Jn. 12, 4. There too an episode is told which has been fixed in writing first after the death of Jesus, *i. e.*, at a time when the treachery of Judas

was a thing of the past. Nevertheless we read in Jn. 12, 4 ὁ μέλλων αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι. Likewise the καὶ before παραδούς is not to be overlooked in this connection. It impresses one, as if something that does not really belong there had been added to the text as an afterthought.

What has been stated here of Mt. 10, 4 applies as a matter of course also to δς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτόν (Mk. 3, 19) and δς ἐγένετο προδότης (Lk. 6, 16). The change in construction and phraseology shows at the same time that the three gospels are not directly dependent one upon the other in this respect, even if the addition which conveys in all three cases the same information may go back originally to one author. It is however difficult to decide whether this notice was in the catalogues, as the evangelists found them, or not.

The Mark catalogue has suffered two more additions besides the one just spoken of. These are the clauses καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ὄνομα Βοανηργές ὃ ἐστὶν υἱοὶ βροντῆς. The glosslike character of these remarks will become evident, as soon as we translate Mk. 3, 16 f. literally: "and Simon he surnamed Peter and James the son of Zebedee and John the brother of James and them he surnamed Boanerges which is Sons of thunder." It is not to be denied that the first ἐπέθηκεν is fully sufficient to bear the weight of the whole sentence. The superfluous repetition of this verb with the dative αὐτοῖς instead of putting Ἰάκωβον τὸν and Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφόν into the dative case, proves that the accusatives are original and that the statements concerning the surnames have been added to the text by a later hand. The missing definite article before ὄνομα is likewise hardly an accident.

The first clause which in the above-given translation is still acceptable cannot be combined with Mk. 3, 16-19. For none of the Twelve except the first three have a surname. Westcott and Hort have therefore placed in their text-edition both our clauses in parentheses in order to call our attention to the fact that they interrupt the train of thought. Likewise Gould (*Internat. Crit. Comment. St. Mark*, p. 57) tells us: "καὶ ἐπέθηκε interrupts the structure of the sentence."

The first clause *καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι* is a kind of parallel to *ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος* (Mt. 10, 2). This addition to the text which is intended to define closely the individuality of the first disciple is very awkward. But it is very likely due to the evangelist himself. The Concordance shows us that the name *Peter* occurs in Mk. twenty times, and that it appears for the first time in our passage Mk. 3, 16. In the first two chapters the apostle is called exclusively, and that five times, *Simon*. This latter name is used afterwards only once (Mk. 14, 37). Mark does not know the combination *Simon Peter*. Thus the evangelist could well judge it advisable when he copied the name *Peter* the first time to remind his readers that this Peter was the same person who up to Mk. 3, 16 is called Simon.

The second clause in all likelihood formed part of the catalogue, as Mark obtained it. It is an isolated historical note. If it were not in our text, it could not be invented on the basis of any New Testament or other information which we possess. Moreover the name Boanerges which is Aramaic points towards a greater age of the clause. On the supposition that the editor of the gospel found the statement about the Sons of Thunder in his copy of the catalogue, the otherwise strange clumsiness of the editorial addition to the text at the beginning of Mk. 3, 16 is easily accounted for. The editor borrowed the verb *ἐπέθηκεν* and the noun *ὄνομα* from the statement he read in his text.

In Lk. 6, 14-16 the words *ὃν καὶ ὠνόμασεν Πέτρον* have to be dropped. This relative clause is a repetition of the preceding clause *οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν*. The purpose of this gloss is the same as that of the kindred additions in Matthew and Mark. But it seems to owe its presence in the text not to Luke but to a later hand. The name *Peter* occurs in the third gospel seventeen times. The first time it is found in Lk. 8, 45. In the first five chapters the apostle's name is five times *Simon* and once (Lk. 5, 8) *Simon Peter*. *Simon* alone is met with besides only in Lk. 22, 31; and 24, 24. Under

these circumstances, the necessity of adding his explanatory remark in Lk. 6, 14 could not recommend itself so readily to the evangelist as in the corresponding passage of Mark. It is not quite so easy to decide whether an earlier or a later hand has to be recognized in said gloss. In my opinion it is a later addition to the text. For a student who was acquainted with the synoptic gospels might easily be tempted to make the text of Luke in this passage conform more closely to that of the other two gospels. Besides, the editorial clause *οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν* furnished the model ready at hand for such a completion of the text.

The text of Acts has evidently been preserved in its original form except that probably the name of the twelfth disciple has been dropped.

If we compare the four catalogues, without taking account of any later accretions to the original text, but observing all differences of expression and arrangement, the four agree in only one single instance; that is the fifth name Philip. The ninth name is almost the same. Still there exists one significant difference. Matthew and Mark read *Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου*, Luke and Acts have *Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίου*. If that were real Greek, we should have to render the first phrase *James the son of Alphæus* and the second James a son of *Alphæus*. Since however the words go back to a Hebrew or Aramaic original, the first translation stands for the real meaning of the words. Nevertheless the double form tells us that the catalogues were translated by two different men.

Matthew, Mark and Luke agree but three times: 5, 6, 9; Matthew and Mark five times: 5, 6, 9, 10, 11; Matthew and Luke four times: 2, 5, 6, 9; Matthew and Acts twice: 5, 9; Mark and Luke five times: 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; Mark and Acts three times: 4, 5, 9; Luke and Acts four times: 5, 9, 10, 11.

This comparison confirms again what we have learned before that the three synoptists did not borrow their catalogues of the apostles the one from the other, but that they copied written lists each of which had its own history before it came into the possession of the evangelist.

The mutual relationship of the four catalogues however appears in a different light when we omit all those clauses and words which we recognized as later additions. In that case the catalogues of Matthew and Luke are almost identical in their first halves, while the same is also true on the other hand of Mark and Acts. It is most significant that Matthew and Luke name the first disciple *Simon*, whereas Mark and Acts introduce the same man as *Peter*. It is still more characteristic that Matthew and Luke enumerate in the second place Simon's brother Andrew, while Mark and Acts have Andrew in the fourth place and are silent as to his relationship with Peter. It is likewise remarkable that Matthew and Luke introduce first the one pair and then the second pair of brothers, while Mark and Acts have James and John inserted between Peter and Andrew. There exists one slight dissimilarity. Acts alone mentions John before James. Nevertheless these pairwise similarities and dissimilarities of the two groups of catalogues compel us to assume an original and close kinship between the first halves of the catalogues of Matthew and Luke on the one hand and those of Mark and Acts on the other hand.

The second halves of the catalogues do not present such a conformity between Matthew and Luke and Mark and Acts. We notice that the names 6, 7, 8, 12 are identical in Mark and Luke. But the same names occur also in the two other catalogues, although in a somewhat different order. It is much more remarkable that the names 9, 10, 11 are pairwise identical in Matthew and Mark and in Luke and Acts respectively. The differences between these two groups are at the same time of a very definite kind. We find in the first group the three names Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, Θαδδαῖος, Σίμων ὁ Καναναῖος and in the second group Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίου, Σιμων ὁ Ζηλωτής, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου. Luke has added to the tenth name the word *καλούμενον*.

We cannot deny that the four catalogues present themselves in two groups. These two groups have been crossed in some way. If we exchange the second halves of the Mark and Luke

catalogues with each other, the result will be that Matthew and Luke on the one hand and Mark and Acts on the other hand become exactly alike. The present four catalogues have therefore been derived from two original and independent catalogues. We may denote the one as the Simon catalogue and the other as the Peter catalogue. It looks, as if the Matthew and Luke catalogues were at one time in the possession of the same owner. The two lists must have been folded together and thereby been broken into two parts each containing one half of the original catalogues. These four halves were then by mistake pasted together in the wrong way, and thus they came finally into the hands of Mark and Luke respectively. In any case it is quite clear that our catalogues had a history, before they were embodied in the present text of the synoptic gospel and the Acts.

In closing we may say a word about the relative age of the four catalogues, as we have them. If the preservation of the simplest form and the absence of later additions is a good sign of old age, the catalogue Ac. 1, 13 must be considered as the oldest. If on the other hand later additions which crept into the text before the evangelist secured his copy indicate a younger text, that of Mark must be the youngest. Luke and Matthew stand in the midst between these two, and that of Luke is probably older, or more original than that of Matthew.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

VI.

DON QUIXOTE.

C. ERNEST WAGNER.

In the province of New Castile, about twenty miles east of Madrid, on the high road leading from the capital to Guadalajara and Saragossa, lies an ancient town, with some 12,000 inhabitants, called Alcalá de Henares. On the baptismal register of the Church of Santa Maria, facing the Plaza Mayor of this town, is an entry which, in its appeal to the imagination, ranks with another entry, found in the parish register of Holy Trinity Church, in far-away Stratford-on-Avon. This entry records the baptism, on October 9, 1547, of Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. From the name given the child, Miguel (Michael), it is assumed that he was born on the Feast of St. Michael (Michaelmas), preceding (Sept. 29); as it was then a common practice, in Roman Catholic Spain, to give a child the name of the saint on whose day he or she happened to be born. The Stratford baptism, you will remember, is of record, April 25, 1564; and from it scholars have agreed to assume that the boy, William Shakspeare, was born not more than two days earlier (April 23), which, in default of documentary evidence, is the date we continue to celebrate. A noteworthy fact, is it not? that these two heaven-sent messengers to a care-burdened world, arriving, the one in Spain and the other in England, not quite seventeen years apart, were in their earthly origin so obscure and humble that the date was deemed unworthy of record or remembrance! Long years afterward, to be sure, when Fame had set her stamp of approval on the gifted Castilian's work, no less than seven other Spanish cities—among them notably Madrid, Toledo and Seville—claimed the honor of being the birthplace of the author of *Don Quixote*.

The Alcalá of Cervantes' boyhood was a very different sort of town from the melancholy, featureless Alcalá of to-day, decaying by the sleepy waters of the Henares. Here the powerful Cardinal Ximenes, under the patronage of Ferdinand, had founded (in 1510) a University, which had already become a rival of its older sister at Salamanca. Indeed, in Cervantes' day, it is reputed to have been attended by as many as seven thousand students! Of this number, we may be reasonably sure that our young "Miguel" was not one. His father, a poor apothecary-surgeon, was hardly in a position to send this son—the fourth of a family of seven children—to the University. Like Shakspeare, the boy can have had little or no formal schooling. His education was such, mainly, as he managed to pick up in the school of practical experience. Of this, as he lived his checkered and eventful life, a full portion fell to his lot.

Miguel de Cervantes, we shall do well to remember, lived during a goodly part of Spain's most brilliant century (1550–1650). The reigns of Philip II and Philip III correspond, in exuberance of life and imperial splendor, to the reigns of Elizabeth and James. In this, her "Golden Age," Spain witnessed the achievement of an empire, the like of which had not been seen since the palmy days of Rome. In literature and art, too, she experienced a renaissance such as only Greece had known in the Age of Pericles, and such as England was even then enjoying under the beneficent rule of "Good Queen Bess." For, be it also remembered, it was during these years of abundance that all her great painters flourished and produced their immortal works: "El Greco," Ribera, Zurbaran, Murillo, and Velasquez. In this electric atmosphere—surcharged with virile life—Cervantes grew from boyhood to youth and from youth to manhood. Little wonder, then, that the latent seed of genius, thus nurtured and fertilized, bore, later, fruit after its own rare kind.

When Miguel de Cervantes, at the age of fifty-five, cast about for a medium which should best serve for the expression

of certain ideas which were germinating in his fertile brain, he chose a literary form, then just gaining vogue in the land of his birth. The story of the *picaro*, or vagabond rogue, had been told more than once by Spanish writers of the sixteenth century; and so common, later on, did the form become, that the adjective "picaresque" is employed by modern scholars to characterize tales of adventure in which the *picaro* is the central figure, whether written actually in Spain or imitated in some foreign land. The great prototype of this interesting genre is the *Lazarillo de Tormes*, first published in 1553—the autobiography of a boy, "Little Lazarus," who began life as the guide of a blind beggar, and through sundry harsh experiences, soon became an accomplished knave. Among well-known confrères of this notable rogue, in other lands, may be mentioned Le Sage's *Gil Blas*, the North German *Till Eulenspiegel*, Thomas Nash's *Jack Wilton, or the Unfortunate Traveller*, Henry Fielding's *Jonathan Wild*, Defoe's *Colonel Jack* and *Moll Flanders*—the latter a full-fledged female *picaro*.

The choice of the picaresque form by Cervantes was a happy inspiration; for he needed only to look within, to draw upon his own rich stores of observation, experience, and hazardous vicissitude, for the material needed to clothe the form with life. It was his treatment, with its underlying purpose, that made the finished work unique. "Like Velasquez in art, so he, in letters, stands out as the only master to elevate the element of realism in the Spanish character to the sphere of genius."

The full title of his immortal tale is, as we all know, "The Life and Achievements of the Ingenious Gentleman, Don Quixote de La Mancha." There are several terms here which need explanation, before we enter upon our consideration of the story. "Ingenious gentleman" renders very imperfectly the Spanish *hidalgo ingenioso*. The *hidalgo* of sixteenth-century Spain was a nobleman of the lower class—a gentleman, in other words, of independent means, whose hands had never been soiled by commerce or trade. His means might be very limited—as indeed they often were—but so long as he main-

tained a semblance of gentility and lived a life of dignified ease, he was styled "hidalgo" and was addressed as "Don." His position and pursuits correspond pretty closely to those of the old-time English squire. For the term *ingenioso* it is most difficult to find an English equivalent. Our adjective "ingenious," which has come, by long use, to connote ingenuity, inventiveness, mental resourcefulness, and manual dexterity, misses the mark entirely. We have to approach it from another angle, and think of "fertility of imagination," "readiness to find out or discover hidden meanings," "quickness of mental invention." The *ingenioso* is one in whom the imagination is the dominant faculty, overruling reason, opposed to the *discreto*, he in whom the discerning faculty has the upper hand, whose reason keeps the imagination under due control. If, then, we must have one word, "imaginative" or "visionary" would come nearer to it than "ingenious." "Don" we have explained. It is the equivalent of "Sir" or "Esquire," in the British sense. "Quixote," our hidalgo's self-chosen appellation, is a made-up word, a variant of his true name, "Quixana" or "Quisada" (jaw-bone), a name which suggests, of course, the lean, cadaverous, lantern-jawed aspect which made him a marked man and caused his squire to dub him "The Knight of the Sorrowful Figure." Before setting out on his knightly exploits, he, however, elected to be styled "Don Quixote" ("Sir Greaves"), from the piece of armor that protected the thighs. La Mancha, the province which Cervantes hit upon as a fit home for his visionary, cadaverous hidalgo, is a small territory lying to the south of Madrid—partly in the kingdom of Aragon and partly in New Castile. In a mean and nameless village of this region—now identified by the commentators as Argamasilla de Alba—lived, in the late sixteenth century, the hero of a tale, whose exploits have resounded through all civilized lands, down to the present year of grace—a matter of some three hundred odd years.

Let us listen, once again, to the opening passages, in the simple, crisp English of Jarvis's version: "Down in a village

of La Mancha, the name of which I have no desire to remember, there lived, not long ago, one of those gentlemen who usually keep a lance upon a rack, an old buckler, a lean horse, and a coursing greyhound. Soup, composed of somewhat more mutton than beef, the fragments served up cold on most nights, lentils on Fridays, collops and eggs on Saturdays, and a pigeon by way of addition on Sundays, consumed three-fourths of his income; the remainder of it supplied him with a cloak of fine cloth, velvet breeches, with slippers of the same for holidays, and a suit of the best homespun, in which he adorned himself on week-days. His family consisted of a housekeeper above forty, a niece not quite twenty, and a lad who served him both in the field and at home, who could saddle the horse or handle the pruning-hook. The age of our gentleman bordered upon fifty years; he was of a strong constitution, spare-bodied, of a meagre visage, a very early riser, and a lover of the chase."

Concerning this poor hidalgo's idiosyncrasy and the hallucination which was the immediate cause of his undoing, we are not kept long in doubt. The second paragraph makes it all quite clear to us: "Be it known, then, that the afore-mentioned gentleman, in his leisure moments, which composed the greater part of the year, gave himself up with so much ardor to the perusal of books of chivalry, that he almost wholly neglected the exercise of the chase, and even the regulation of his domestic affairs; indeed, so extravagant was his zeal in this pursuit, that he sold many acres of arable land to purchase books of knight-errantry, collecting as many as he could possibly obtain. Among them all, none pleased him so much as those written by the famous Feliciano de Silva, whose brilliant prose and intricate style were, in his opinion, infinitely precious; especially those amorous speeches and challenges in which they so abound. These and similar rhapsodies distracted the poor gentleman, for he labored to comprehend and unravel their meaning, which was more than Aristotle himself could do, were he to rise from the dead expressly for that purpose."

The third paragraph introduces the priest and the barber of

the village, with whom he had many an argument as to which had been the better knight, Palamon of England, or Amadis of Gaul. "In short, he became so infatuated with this kind of study, that he passed whole days and nights over these books. His imagination was full of all that he had read—of enchantments, contests, battles, challenges, wounds, courtships, amours, tortures, and impossible absurdities; and so firmly was he persuaded of the truth of the whole tissue of visionary fiction that, in his mind, no history in the world was more authentic."

In the fourth paragraph, we learn of his resolve to make a knight-errant of himself, roaming the world over, in full armor and on horseback, in quest of adventures, and putting in practice himself all that he had read of as being the usual practices of knights-errant; righting every kind of wrong and exposing himself to peril and danger, from which, in the issue, he was to reap eternal renown and fame. Having made this resolve, the first thing he did was to scour up some armor that had belonged to his great-grandfather, and had lain for many years, forgotten in a corner, eaten with rust and covered with mildew.

"In the next place he visited his steed; and although this animal had more blemishes than the horse of Goulet—'that thing of hide and bone'—yet, in his eyes, neither the *Bucephalus* of Alexander, nor the Babieca of the Cid, could be compared with him. Four days was he deliberating upon what name he should give him; for, as he said to himself, it would be very improper that a horse so excellent, appertaining to a knight so famous, should be without an appropriate name. . . . So, after having devised, altered, lengthened, curtailed, rejected, and again framed in his imagination a variety of names, he finally determined upon '*Rozinante*,' a name, in his opinion, lofty, sonorous, and full of meaning; importing that he had been only a *rozin*, a drudge-horse, before ('ante') his present condition, and that now he was *before* all the *rozins* in the world."

"Having got a name for his horse, so much to his taste, he re-

solved to fix upon one for himself. This consideration employed him eight days more, when at length he determined to call himself 'Don Quixote.' . . . Then recollecting that the valorous Amadis, not content with the simple appellation of 'Amadis,' added thereto the name of his kingdom and native country, in order to render it famous, styling himself Amadis of Gaul; so he, like a good knight, also added the name of his province, and called himself 'Don Quixote de Le Mancha;' whereby, in his opinion, he fully proclaimed his lineage and country, which, at the same time, he honored by taking its name."

"His armor being now furbished, his helmet made perfect, his horse and himself provided with names, he found nothing wanting but a lady to be in love with, for a knight-errant without the tender passion was a tree without leaves and fruit—a body without a soul. 'If,' said he, 'for my sins, or rather, through my good fortune, I encounter some giant—an ordinary occurrence to knights-errant—and overthrow him at the first onset, or cleave him in twain, or, in short, vanquish him and force him to surrender, must I not have some lady to whom I may send him as a present? that when he enters into the presence of my charming mistress, he may throw himself upon his knees before her, and in a submissive, humble voice, say, "Madam, in me you behold the giant Caraculiambro, lord of the island Malendrania, who, being vanquished in single combat by the never-enough-to-be-praised Don Quixote de La Mancha, am by him commanded to present myself before you, to be disposed of according to the will and pleasure of your highness." How happy was our good night after this harangue! How much more so when he found a mistress! It is said that, in a neighboring village, a good-looking peasant girl resided, of whom he had formerly been enamored, although it does not appear that she ever knew or cared about it; and this was the lady whom he chose to nominate mistress of his heart. He then sought a name for her, which, without entirely departing from her own, should incline and approach towards that of a

princess or great lady, and determined upon 'Dulcinea del Toboso' (for she was a native of that village), a name, he thought, harmonious, uncommon, and expressive—like all the others which he had adopted."

I have rehearsed the greater part of this first chapter, not only to taste anew the delightful quality of the story—like rare Amontillado, "cooled a long age in the deep-delved earth"—but to remind you how clearly the author's purpose, as announced in his Preface, is revealed in this opening chapter. That purpose, he has plainly told us, is two-fold: (1) "To destroy the authority and influence which books of chivalry had gained in the world and with the public of his day," and (2) "That, in reading his story, the melancholy may be moved to laughter and the merry made merrier still; that the simple shall not be wearied; that the judicious shall admire the invention; that the grave shall not despise it, nor the wise fail to praise it." This latter is, in short, the artist's purpose—the desire to please his readers (whose name he hopes may be legion), by means of true, convincing, craftsmanlike work.

Why trouble ourselves further about the meaning or purpose of this undying book—as so many of the critics have done? The author has vouched for it. Why not take him at his word? The zeal which impelled him was simply a zeal for pure literature. He hated and despised the earlier works of chivalry (the fantastic ones), because they brought the romantical way of writing into disrepute, and reduced chivalry to braggadocio and rhodomontade. Cervantes himself was a romanticist, as the *Galatea*, the *Numancia*, and sundry other works of his sufficiently prove. That he was chivalric, by instinct and in practice—chivalric in the true sense—no one who has read his life aright, will question. Why seek, then, for a clew to the hidden motive of *Don Quixote*? If you will have it a personal satire—on the clergy, the church, or an individual high up in the councils of the state—you run the risk of being numbered among "those who cannot conceive how any man should be guilty of humor and yet intend no malice." Now Cervantes was

a humorist, if there ever was one. Being a humorist, he could think of more than one thing at a time. In other words, his was not "a single-track mind;" and this generous equipment of his saved him from many a deplorable collision and catastrophe. Surely a man who could keep his nature sweet and sunny after a life-long buffeting by adverse Fortune, was not the man to dip his pen in venom and indulge himself in the gratification of a personal pique!

Having cleared the ground of all encumbering rubbish, let us proceed now to examine the very simple structure of his engaging tale—a tale which, by its ineffable charm, has served, through the centuries, to "hold children from play, and old men from the chimney-corner." It is pleasant here to recall an oft-told story: "Philip III, being, one day, at a window of his palace in Madrid, observed a student reading a book, as he was walking on the banks of the Manzanares, who frequently gave himself a blow on the forehead, which he accompanied with more vigorous signs of great pleasure. The monarch, immediately guessing at the cause of his mirth, exclaimed: 'That student is either mad, or reading *Don Quixote*.' Some person who was about him, with an idea of pleasing the King, sent immediately to inquire into the truth, and found that the student really was reading it!"

But to return to the author's plot. Don Quixote sallies forth alone, armed *cap a pie*, on a sultry morning, late in July. He gives Rozinante his head, thinking that a likely way to encounter the much-coveted adventures. But, he has not gone far, when a serious scruple troubles him—one all but enough to make him abandon the enterprise, in hand, at the very outset. He had not been dubbed a knight; and, therefore, according to the law of chivalry, he neither could nor ought to bear arms against any other knight! This omission is made good by a ludicrous ceremony in the yard of the inn—to his diseased imagination a castle—where he lodges at the end of the first day's journey. Being charged by the innkeeper, who, to humor him, performs the ceremony of "dubbing," that no knight could

consider himself equipped, who went without a well-filled purse, a change of shirts, and an attendant squire, our new-made paladin returns to his home, on the second day, resolved to supply these deficiencies. On the way he meets with two adventures—the first having significant results. For his meddling with a farmer, whom he discovers beating a neglectful shepherd, the boy receives, after this would-be redresser of wrongs has gone complacently on his way, a flogging with compound interest added. From his second adventure with the muleteers he escapes in sad plight, and is received with loud upbraidings, by his housekeeper and niece. Craving only rest and sleep, he is put to bed, where he remains until recovered from his fearful drubbing.

During this interlude occurs the burning of the knight's beloved library, performed, in cavalier fashion, by the priest, the barber, the irate housekeeper, and the tearful niece. This is one of the most exquisite chapters in the book. The running comments of the incendiaries, and the way in which the mischievous volumes are scrutinized and consigned, one by one to the flames, form a truly diverting episode. A bare fourteen or fifteen volumes escape the holocaust, among them being the famous *Amadis de Gaul* and Cervantes' own favorite romance, the *Galatea*.

This interim covers a period of eighteen days, during which the happily contrived Sancho is introduced, as a foil to our errant knight's extravagant humors. Having recovered his strength and spirits, "Don Quixote set to work upon the plastic clay of a certain farm-laborer, a neighbor of his, and an honest man, but shallow-brained. In short, he said so much, used so many arguments, and made so many promises, that the poor fellow resolved to sally out with him and serve him in the capacity of a squire. Among other things, Don Quixote told him that he ought to be very glad to accompany him, for such an adventure might some time or the other occur, that by one stroke an island might be won, where he might leave him governor. With this and other promises, Sancho Panza (for that was the

laborer's name) left his wife and children, and engaged himself as squire to his neighbor." When the newly-articled squire suggests taking an ass with him, as he had a very good one and was not used to travel much on foot, the knight at first demurs, not being able to recall an instance where a knight-errant had carried a squire mounted on ass-back. On second thought, however, he relents, resolving to accommodate his squire more honorably at the earliest opportunity, by dismounting the first discourteous knight he should meet. He provided himself also with shirts, and other things, conformably to the advice given by the innkeeper.

All this being accomplished, "Don Quixote and Sancho Panzo, without taking leave, the one of his wife and children, or the other of his housekeeper and niece, one night sallied out of the village unperceived; and they travelled so hard that by break of day they believed themselves secure, even if search were made for them. Sancho Panza proceeded upon his ass like a patriarch, with his wallet and leathern bottle, and with a vehement desire to find himself governor of the island which his master had promised him. Don Quixote happened to take the same route as on his first expedition, over the plain of Montiel, which he passed with less inconvenience than before; for it was early morning, and the rays of the sun, darting on them horizontally, did not annoy them."

While discoursing pleasantly about the "island," they come in sight of thirty or forty windmills, scattered about the plain before them. These famous windmills, it may be of interest to know, had not been very long set up, and owed their existence to the failure of water power in the Zancara, an affluent of the Guadiana, about thirty years before *Don Quixote* was written. Their comparative novelty, then, as objects in the landscape, and the fact that these Spanish mills are very much lower than the windmills we are accustomed to think of, bring this amazing adventure somewhat nearer the bounds of credibility. It is, perhaps, the best-known and most frequently-cited of all our valiant knight's achievements. Adventures now follow fast and

furious. Each day and many a night has its thrilling episode. Life need not be dull, if one will only keep looking for trouble!

They pass their first night under the shelter of some trees. On the afternoon of the second day they reach the ill-famed Pass of Lapice, where, said the knight, "we may plunge our arms up to the elbows in what are termed adventures." Here they encounter two harmless friars, of the order of St. Benedict, who are straightway mistaken for the abductors of a Biscayan lady, who chances to be following, in a coach, not far behind. This necessitates the undoing of the friars and a passage-at-arms with the lady's able-bodied attendant. Then follows more talk about the "island" and the high order of knight-errantry. They sup with some goatherds, whom they happen to meet. After one of the two wine-skins, that were in sight, had been drained, and Don Quixote had quite appeased his appetite, he took up a handful of the dried acorns, upon which they had been feeding and, contemplating them attentively, delivered himself of that eulogy of the Golden Age, which is one of the literary gems of the book, and is quoted in every Spanish anthology. The theme is the theme of the exiled Duke, rhapsodizing beneath the oaks in the Forest of Arden. And, now, note the effect of this wine-inspired effusion upon the knight's auditors. "The goatherds listened to him, gazing in amazement, without saying a word in reply. Sancho likewise held his peace, and ate acorns, and paid repeated visits to the second wine-skin, which they had hung up on a cork tree. to keep the wine cool."

In this two-days' journey, along the blazing, dusty road, we have an epitome of the days that are to follow. Since the early morning start from Argamasilla, in the company of our knight, sitting high on his raw-boned nag, and Sancho by his side, on patient little Dapple, we have seen low wind-mills dotting the plain of Montiel; we have slept beneath some wayside trees; we have met, in the Pass of Lapice, Benedictine friars astride their mules, and a Biscayan lady, travelling in her coach; and now, when evening comes again, we sit with some rough goat-

herds, before their hut, and sup on cheese, made from the strong milk of the animals they tend, and on parched acorns of the ilex or evergreen oak; and, to wash the dry fare down, we drink—if our consciences permit—of a liquid drawn from a dark skin, hanging on a cork tree overhead. How Spanish it all is! racy of the soil, redolent of the atmosphere, the strong viands, and the potent, vivifying drink.

Among the outstanding incidents which follow are the disastrous adventure with the Yanguesian carriers, in which our travellers are involved through the light conduct of the otherwise impeccable Rozinante; the farcical experiences at the inn, which Don Quixote (true to his bent) unhappily mistakes for another castle; the grand adventure and rich prize of Mambrino's helmet; the release of the notorious Giles de Passamonte and other members of the chain-gang, on their way to "durance vile"—with the gratitude they exhibited therefor; the series of uncommonly exciting adventures in the Sierra Morena, with the fantastic penance there undergone by Don Quixote as a lover; the dreadful battle which Don Quixote fought with the wine skins; the adventure with the famous Infanta Micomiconia; the extraordinary experiences at another inn, where we make the acquaintance of the never-to-be-forgotten Maritornes; the notable adventure of the Holy Brotherhood, in which our good knight exhibits unbelievable ferocity; and finally, the rare adventure of the Disciplinants, which Don Quixote accomplished with the sweat of his brow. By a clever ruse, the priest and barber, who have gone out in quest of their fellow-villager, succeed in bringing him back (by "enchantment," as he himself believes) to his home.

Through fifty-two chapters we have followed him through a maze of astounding adventures—eked out, it is true, with sundry short tales and two longer novels, entitled, "The Curious Impertinent" and "The Captive," previously written and now interpolated by the author—and yet, despite all these moving accidents, our hero has been absent only seventeen days. The return journey occupies but six days, showing that he had not been very far afield.

Let us hearken, now, to the recital of this strange homecoming. "It was about noon when the party made their entrance into Don Quixote's village; and, it being Sunday, all the people were standing about the market-place, through which the wagon passed. Everybody ran to see who was in it, and were not a little surprised when they recognized their townsman; and a boy ran off, at full speed, with tidings to the housekeeper that he was coming home, lean and pale, stretched out at length in a wagon drawn by oxen (for so, indeed, he was brought back!). On hearing this, the two good women made the most pathetic lamentations, and renewed their curses against books of chivalry; especially when they saw the poor knight entering the gate. . . . After undressing him, they laid him in his old bed, whence he looked at them with eyes askance, not knowing perfectly where he was. Often did the women raise their voices in abuse of all books of chivalry, overwhelming their authors with the bitterest maledictions. His niece was charged by the priest to take great care of him, and to keep a watchful eye that he did not again make his escape, after taking so much pains to get him home. Yet they were full of apprehension lest they should lose him again, as soon as he found himself a little better; and, indeed the event proved that their fears were not groundless."

Here the author leaves him. Ten years elapsed before the sequel appeared. Cervantes was fifty-seven when Part I. issued from the press (1605), and sixty-seven now, on the eve of the publication of Part II. (1615). There will always be, I suppose, a difference of opinion as to the relative merits of the First and Second Parts of *Don Quixote*. As naturally follows from the date and circumstances of composition, the First Part is richer in laughable incidents and what we call "local color;" the Second, in character study and the "criticism of life." The First will continue to be the favorite of those who love action and whose taste leans to humor of a farcical sort; whereas the Second will have the preference with those who incline to the humor of comedy, as distinguished from roaring farce.

"Another and very palpable reason why the Second Part has less of the purely ludicrous element in it is that Cervantes, having now a greater respect for his hero, is more careful of his personal dignity. In the interests of the story, he has to allow Don Quixote to be made a butt of, to some extent; but he spares him the cudgellings and cuffings which are the usual finale of the poor hidalgo's adventures in Part I."

The opening chapters of Part II. tell us of what passed between the priest, the barber, and Don Quixote concerning the latter's indisposition; of the notable quarrel between Sancho Panza and Don Quixote's niece and housekeeper; of the pleasant conversation which passed between Don Quixote, Sancho Panza, and the bachelor, Samson Carrasco; of the discreet and pleasant conversation which passed between Sancho Panza and his wife, Teresa; of what passed between Don Quixote, his niece, and housekeeper; and of what passed between Don Quixote and his squire, preliminary to their second expedition together—in reality, the knight's third sally. The seventh chapter concludes as follows: "Three days were now employed in preparation, at the end of which time, Sancho having appeased his wife, and Don Quixote his niece and housekeeper, they issued forth in the evening, unobserved by any except the bachelor, who insisted on bearing them company half a league from the village. The knight was mounted on his good Rozinante, and the squire on his trusty Dapple, his wallets stored with food and his purse with money, providently supplied by his master in case of need. When Samson took his leave, he expressed an earnest desire to have advice of his good or ill fortune, that he might rejoice or condole with him, as the laws of friendship required. Don Quixote promised to comply with this request, the bachelor returned to the village, and the knight and squire pursued their way towards the great city of Toboso."

The succeeding chapters relate, among other things, what befell Don Quixote, as he was going to visit his lady, the peerless Dulcinea del Toboso; the cunning used by Sancho in en-

chanting the Lady Dulcinea; the strange adventure with the cart, or wain, of the Cortes of Death; the adventures with the Knight of the Mirrors and the Knight of the Wood; and the adventure with the Lions, wherein is set forth "the extreme and highest point at which the courage of Don Quixote ever did or ever could arrive." At the happy conclusion of this adventure, you will remember, he desired to have his style changed from "The Knight of the Sorrowful Figure" to "The Knight of the Lions!" After this, we have an account of what befell Don Quixote in the castle, or house, of the Knight of the Green Riding Coat; of the marriage of Camacho, the Rich and the adventure of Basilius, the Poor; of the grand adventure of the Cave of Montesinos, situated in the heart of La Mancha; of the braying adventure (which turned out so badly for Sancho), and the diverting one of the Puppet Show, with the memorable divinations of the Educated Ape; of the famous adventure of the Enchanted Bark, and of what befell Don Quixote with a Fair Huntress—the anonymous Duchess of the story, who, with her Duke, entertained the travellers many days at their castle, and amused themselves immoderately, and, in Charles Lamb's opinion, shamefully, at the expense of their guests. During this memorable visit occur the adventure of Clavileno, the enchanted steed, and sundry embarrassing adventures with the witty and wanton Altisidora and the Duenna, Donna Rodriguez. Here occurs, also, the laughable interlude of Sancho's government of the long-promised "island," elaborately contrived by the humor-loving Duke and his Duchess. In the concluding chapters we read, among many exciting incidents, of the prodigious and unparalleled battle between Don Quixote and the lackey, Tosilos, in defence of the Duenna Donna Rodriguez' daughter; of what befell Don Quixote on his way to Barcelona and at his entrance into that gay city; of Sancho Panza's misfortune on board the galleys; of the extraordinary adventure of the beautiful Moor; and of the adventure which "gave Don Quixote more vexation than any which had hitherto befallen him." Hard upon this comes the knight's

resolve to turn shepherd and lead a pastoral life, followed by a certain "bristly" adventure, on the road home; and then by "the newest and strangest adventure of all that befell Don Quixote, in the whole course of this great history!" The very last chapters narrate what befell Don Quixote and his squire, on the way to their village, and how they arrived there. This third expedition of the knight covers a period of eighty-seven days, which, with the seventeen days of the second sally and the two days of the first, make a total of one hundred and six days passed in quest of adventures.

"Thus hoping and expecting" (to meet the disenchanted lady, Dulcinea del Toboso), "the knight and squire ascended a little eminence, whence they discovered their village; which Sancho no sooner beheld than, kneeling down, he said, 'Open thine *eyes*, O my beloved country! and behold thy son, Sancho Panza, returning to thee, again, if not rich, yet well whipped! Open thine *arms*, and receive thy son, Don Quixote, too! who, though worsted by another, has conquered himself, which, as I have heard say, is the best kind of victory! Money I have gotten, and though I have been soundly banged, I have come off like a gentleman.' 'Leave these fooleries, Sancho,' quoth Don Quixote, and let us go directly to our homes, where we will give full scope to our imagination, and settle our intended scheme of a pastoral life.' They now descended the hill, and went straight to the village."

This newly-formed purpose was, however, not to be realized. Bad omens confronted the knight, on entering his village; he soon fell sick, made his will, and, on the tenth day after his return, surrounded by his niece, the housekeeper, the priest, the bachelor, Samson Carrasco, Master Nicholas, the barber, and the tearful Sancho, he quietly passed away. "The notary, who had drawn up the will, and who was also present, protested he had never read in any book of chivalry of a knight-errant dying in his bed, in so composed and Christian a manner as Don Quixote. When the priest, who had confessed him, saw that he was no more, he desired the notary to draw up a certifi-

cate, stating that Alonzo Quixano, commonly called Don Quixote de La Mancha, had departed this life and died a natural death; which testimonial he required, *lest any other authors . . . should raise him from the dead, and impose upon the world with their fabulous stories of his exploits.*" (An allusion to the spurious *Don Quixote*, which had appeared while Cervantes was at work upon the Second Part.)

Our author's closing words, which confirm the promise made in the Preface, are worth recalling here: . . . "for the sole object of my labors was to expose to the contempt they deserved the extravagant and silly tricks of chivalry, which this of *my true and genuine Don Quixote* has nearly accomplished; their credit in the world being now actually tottering, and, will doubtless soon sink altogether, never to rise again."

It was Lord Byron who said, and his saying has been often quoted: "Cervantes smiled Spain's chivalry away." This clever saying is true or false, according as we interpret the term "Chivalry." If by Chivalry we mean the extravagant, artificial sentiment which formed the stock-in-trade of all the old "Chivalry Books," then Lord Byron was unquestionably right. By means of ridicule, very subtly used, Cervantes succeeded in demolishing what yet remained of this preposterous, fast-crumbling structure. There were no more Chivalry Books written in Spain, after *Don Quixote*. But if, on the other hand, we mean, by Chivalry, the genuine thing, enshrined for us in the noble derivative "chivalrous," then Lord Byron's dictum is both shallow and misleading.

That Spanish chivalry is a real and quite distinctive quality—indigenous to the national character and of remarkable tenacity—there are abundant evidences in History and Art. Two illustrations now occur to me, which I cannot forbear citing. In the Velasquez *salon* of the Prado Museum, at Madrid—a room unique among European galleries—hangs a large canvas, commemorating "The Surrender of Breda," painted in 1647, and commonly known as "The Lances." In characterization, coloring, and arrangement, this is one of Velasquez' three ac-

knowledge masterpieces (all assembled in this room); and there is probably nowhere a nobler example of historical painting. In fact, by one critic it has been called "the greatest heroic picture in the world." But to me, the most interesting feature of this great picture is the attitude and bearing of the victor, Spinola, as the artist has chosen to portray him. With incomparable dignity he bends slightly forward, and in a kindly, courteous, and sympathetic manner, receives the submission of the unfortunate Justin of Nassau. To the fine-fibred Spaniard, *noblesse oblige* is instinctive. And, again, so late as July 3, 1898, when Admiral Cervera surrendered his fleet, at Santiago de Cuba, to our victorious Sampson, there was, according to the newspaper accounts, then published, an exhibition of high-spirited chivalry, no less gracious in defeat than, in time past, it has shown itself generous in victory.

Hegel's characterization of our author's work is more searching and, to my mind, more satisfying than Lord Byron's. In his treatise on "Aesthetics," he says of *Don Quixote*: "It is, on the one hand, a satire on romantic chivalry, charged with *irony*, through and through. On the other hand, the author uses the adventures of his hero as a thread on which he strings, in a most charming way, a number of really *romantic* tales, as if to bring back, in its true value, what the rest of the story, with its *comic* spirit, has dissolved"—which, after all, is only another way of saying, what we remarked earlier, that Cervantes, being a humorist, could think of more than one thing at a time; could operate two separate trains of thought, on parallel tracks, without danger of collision.

Let us give our remaining time to a critical estimate of *Don Quixote*, as a work of Art, in the endeavor to determine, if we may, what constitutes its greatness, and what is the secret of its enduring fame. The author's plan is so simple as to need no further discussion; it is perfectly obvious to the most casual reader. His purpose, his manner of treatment, his handling of the *dramatis personæ*, his delineation of character, are matters that demand some detailed study.

Apart from the broad, self-evident purpose to discredit mock chivalry, what is the author's more specific purpose in his two master creations, Don Quixote and Sancho Panza. Let us hear, first, what a sympathetic and appreciative student of the old school has to say on this subject—Lockhart, the friend and biographer of Sir Walter Scott. In his Introduction to an edition of Motteux' translation of *Don Quixote*, published in 1822, he declares: "*Don Quixote* is thus the peculiar property as well as the peculiar pride of the Spaniards. In another and in a yet larger point of view, it is the property and pride of the whole of the cultivated world—for Don Quixote is not merely to be regarded as a Spanish cavalier, filled with a Spanish madness and exhibiting that madness in the eyes of Spaniards of every condition and rank of life, from the peasant to the grandee,—he is also the type of a more universal madness, he is the symbol of Imagination, continually struggling and contrasted with Reality—he represents the eternal warfare between Enthusiasm and Necessity—the eternal discrepancy between the aspirations and the occupations of man—the omnipotence and the vanity of human dreams. And thus, perhaps, it is not too much to say that *Don Quixote*, the wittiest and the most laughable of all books—a book which has made many a one, beside the young student on the banks of the Manzanares, look as if he were *out of himself*—is a book, upon the whole, calculated to produce something very different from a merely mirthful impression."

Contrast with this the breezy, outspoken opinion of a contemporary critic, who is entitled to a no less respectful hearing—Mr. John Ormsby. In the Introduction to his excellent translation of *Don Quixote*, published in 1885, he protests: "To call *Don Quixote* a sad book, preaching a pessimistic view of life, argues a total misconception of its drift. It would be so, if its moral were that, in this world, true enthusiasm leads to ridicule and discomfiture. But it preaches nothing of the sort; its moral, so far as it can be said to have one, is that the spurious enthusiasm that is born of vanity and self-conceit, that

is made an end in itself, not a means to an end, and that acts on mere impulse, regardless of circumstances and consequences, is mischievous to its owner, and a very considerable nuisance to the community at large. To those who cannot distinguish between the one kind and the other, no doubt *Don Quixote* is a sad book; no doubt, to some minds it is very sad that a man who had just uttered so beautiful a sentiment as that 'it is a hard case to make slaves of those whom God and Nature made free,' should be ungratefully pelted by the scoundrels his crazy philanthropy had let loose on society; but to others of a more judicial cast it will be a matter of regret that reckless, self-sufficient enthusiasm is not oftener requited in some such way for all the mischief it does in the world." And in this timely, up-to-date application of the between-the-lines "moral" of the book, there is much food for thought.

Don Quixote, it does not take the discerning reader long to discover, is a monomaniac, wholly obsessed by a delusion, and crazy only on one subject. The author is at pains, particularly in Part II., to make this point clear. Whenever he permits him to discourse on any subject save Chivalry, and all that pertains thereto—be it the drama, the canons of literary criticism, or ethics applied to human conduct—he is absolutely sane, revealing an intellect of exceptional strength and a judgment remarkably sound. With a Shaksperian understanding of the value of contrast, he opposes to this visionary, this hare-brained enthusiast, the unimaginative, hard-headed realist; and the contest is on!

"Sancho Panza is the perpetual counterfoil of his master—the man of vulgar reason, without romance, opposed to the man of fine understanding, warped by imagination. These two characters possess the world between them, as Coleridge has said, and it is Cervantes' peculiar happiness that he has been enabled to exhibit them in action, making of the individual creature a permanent type, and so elevating the Manchegan peasant as that he serves, like his master, as the denominator for a whole species. By a subtle stroke of art, which

reaches to the profoundest depth of human nature, the victory only remains with the unimaginative, practical man of reason, when the enthusiast, the man of intelligence, recovers his wits!"

In that pathetic death-bed scene, when the solicitous squire, mindful of past successes, seeks once more to play upon the credulity of his master, and by holding out to him false hopes of future exploits, endeavors to console him for the humiliation suffered in that last melancholy defeat at Barcelona, and when the bachelor equally solicitous seeks to reinforce Sancho's well-meant words of cheer—the poor, disillusioned knight refuses again to be fooled: "Gentlemen," quoth Don Quixote, "let us proceed fair and softly" (with the last will and testament, upon which he was now engaged); "*look not for this year's birds in last year's nests.* I was mad; I am now sane; I was Don Quixote de La Mancha; I am now, as formerly, styled Alonzo Quixano, the Good, and may my repentance and sincerity restore me to the esteem you once had for me!—now let the notary proceed." And a final, serio-comic touch is added, in the second "Item" following: "It is also my will that, if Antonia Quixano my niece, should be inclined to marry, it shall be only with a man who, upon the strictest inquiry, shall be found to know nothing of books of chivalry; and in case it shall appear that he is acquainted with such books, and that my niece, notwithstanding, will and doth marry him, then shall she forfeit all I have bequeathed her, which my executors may dispose of in pious uses, as they think proper."

It is evident that, of the two leading characters, Sancho Panza was, in Cervantes' day, the more popular. He made, what we call, a decided "hit." He seems, too, to have been his creator's favorite. Personally, I prefer the Sancho Panza of the First Part. He is more natural, more spontaneous, gives himself fewer airs, and in short, "knows his place" better. In the Second Part, he is much more self-conscious and often offensively "fresh." This is due, in a measure, to the popular demand for more of him, and to the fact that his head is turned

by the Duchess's ill-concealed partiality for him. In Part 1, he is like the Falstaff of *Henry IV*; in Part II, he is the buffoon Falstaff of *The Merry Wives*—made to order and not nearly so well done. I except, of course, his governorship of the make-believe "island." In that office he is inimitable, as he is, also, in the dialogue with the Duchess, which precedes his assumption of office, and in his sagacious observations on renouncing it.

The Duchess, you remember, was immensely amused by Sancho's account of the part he had played in the "enchantment" of the lady, Donna Dulcinea del Toboso, and of how completely he had deceived his gullible master. "From what honest Sancho has told me," said the Duchess, "a certain scruple troubles me, and something whispers in my ear, saying, 'Since Don Quixote de La Mancha is such a lunatic and simpleton, surely Sancho Panza, his squire, who knows it, and yet follows and serves him, relying on his vain promises, must be more mad than his master! Now this being the case, it will surely turn to bad account if to such a Sancho Panza I give an island to govern; for how should he who rules himself so ill, be able to govern others?'" "Faith, Madam," quoth Sancho, "that same scruple is an honest scruple, and need not speak in a whisper, but plain out, or as it lists; for I know it says true, and had I been wise, I should long since have left my master; but such is my lot, or such my evil-errantry, I cannot help it—follow him I must; we are both of the same town, I have eaten his bread, I love him, and he returns my love; he gave me his ass-colts; above all, I am faithful, so that nothing in the world can part us but the sexton's spade and shovel, and if your highness does not choose to give me the government you promised, God made me without it, and perhaps it may be all the better for my conscience if I do not get it; for, fool as I am, I understand the proverb, 'The pismire had wings to her sorrow;' and perhaps it may be easier for Sancho the squire to get to heaven than for Sancho the governor."

Coleridge, always a penetrating critic, says of Sancho: "he

reverences his master at the very time he is cheating him." And, in truth, it would seem so. In his bearing toward the Don, he rarely oversteps the line which separates insolence from respect. And this delicate touch of individualization does much to reveal the essential dignity of the ill-starred knight. He is, despite all his fatuous errors and humiliating experiences, still the blue-veined Castilian hidalgo—the gentleman born and bred, the knight *sans peur et sans reproche*, chivalrous to the core, and disdaining always to stoop to an ignoble deed. The indignities he suffers touch not the *soul* of him. The bravest of the brave he is, in a knightly way, and, whether we will or no, wins our respect by his sheer, unwavering valor.

In the memorable adventure of the fulling-mills—one of the most delightful in the book—the divergent natures of the two men are admirably revealed by contrast. "When Sancho heard this resolution of his master" (to meet the unknown danger), "he dissolved into tears," and said: "Sir, I cannot think why your worship should encounter this fearful adventure. It is now night, and nobody sees us. We may easily turn aside, and get out of danger, though we should not drink these three days; and, being unseen, we cannot be taxed with cowardice. Besides, I have heard the priest of our village, whom your worship knows very well, say in the pulpit that 'he who seeketh danger perisheth therein;' so that it is not good to tempt God by undertaking so extravagant an exploit, whence there is no escaping but by a miracle." To this entreaty Don Quixote made reply: "It shall never be said of me, now nor at any time, that tears or entreaties could dissuade me from performing the duty of a knight: therefore I pray thee, Sancho, be silent; for God, who has inspired me with courage to attempt this unparalleled and fearful adventure, will not fail to watch over my safety, and comfort thee in thy sadness. All thou hast to do is to girt Rozinante well, and remain here; for I will quickly return, alive or dead." Falstaff and Hotspur again! The one with his high spirit and mettlesome courage, who would "pluck bright Honor from the pale-faced moon," and the other, of

low ideals and baser metal, who unblushingly protests: "What is Honor? Can Honor set to a leg? or an arm? or take away the grief of a wound? No. Therefore I'll none of it."

Indeed, Sancho reminds us often of Falstaff. He is not only a coward, a glutton, and a winebibber—like his English cousin; but, like him, he is wholly destitute of a sense of honor or any nice conscientious scruples. And, above all, he is, like Falstaff, the very "Father of Lies"—a magnificent, irresponsible liar, who cuts his falsehoods out of the whole cloth and proffers them with shameless gusto.

Sancho Panza's proverbs are a feature of the story. They have been collected, and fill a small-sized volume. Homely and shrewd they all are—embodying the philosophy of a *frank materialist*, who stands with both feet planted firmly on Mother Earth, and refuses to be moved by all the high-flown sentiments of the *idealist*, whose head is buried in the clouds.

Of the minor characters—and there is, in this moving chronicle, a rich and varied collection of them—I have not space here to speak. On this point, Mr. Ormsby well says: "Cervantes, never, even for the most temporary purpose, puts forward a *lay figure*. There is life and individuality in all his characters, however little they may have to do, or however short a time they may be before the reader. Samson Carrasco, the Priest, Teresa Panza, Altisidora, even the two students met on the road to the Cave of Montesinos, all live and move and have their being; and it is characteristic of the broad humanity of Cervantes that there is not a hateful one among them all. Even poor Maritornes, with her deplorable morals, has a kind heart of her own and 'some faint and distant resemblance to a Christian about her.'"

A recent magazine writer asks, "How many people nowadays read *Don Quixote*? Is it, any more than Milton's *Paradise Lost*, ever taken down from the shelf, and actually read?" I have no quarrel with those who say they find it a dull and stupid book. It means more to me, since I have been in Spain; and each time I take it up, I am forthwith "on the road"

again, in that land of mystery and romance. "For Spain, from the great Rock in the South, which is a Pillar of Hercules, to the Pass in the North, which is Roncesvalles (where Roland died), is verily a land of romance—full of the scenes of stories; and of these there are none better known than the places of Don Quixote's wanderings. We know the unhappy library and the courtyard, where the books were burned; we know the dried water-courses and the windmills in the open country and the fulling-mills by the river. There is a very strong light on the landscape where the sun beats down on the shadowless, grassless plain, and the air is full of dazzling heat, and the dust rises." The interminable roads are alive with mules and little, shaggy donkeys, toiling along under grievous burdens. There are cows and bulls and goats and sheep; swarthy market-women and brown-cloaked, mustachioed *caballeros*; wayside shrines and swarming *posadas*. There are mountain solitudes and savage passes, and dark woods and brawling brooks. And over all there is the glamour of romance, the spell of a hoary antiquity, which reckes little of the passing centuries. It is still the Spain which Cervantes knew and loved, and enshrined for us in the glowing pages of *Don Quixote*.

What, then, it is pertinent for us to ask, is the place of Cervantes' masterpiece among the great books of the world? Certain it is that no kindred soul, among the many who have written upon *Don Quixote*, has failed to pay tribute to the genius of its author. Respecting its rank or place, Dr. Johnson esteemed it as "the greatest in the world, after the *Iliad*, and one of the three, written by man, which the readers wish to be longer." Lord Macaulay, in a familiar letter to a friend, confesses: "I am going through *Don Quixote* again, and admire it more than ever. It is certainly the best novel in the world, beyond all comparison." Edward Fitzgerald called it "the most delightful of all books." Charles Lamb found unfailing pleasure in it. With Heine, arch-mocker, and Swift, prince of satirists, it was a prime favorite. Water Scott's *Letters* contain

many felicitous quotations and appreciative allusions. Dickens was, of course, an admirer and disciple of Cervantes, and Thackeray, quick to recognize the master's influence upon him, once spoke jestingly of "Don Pickwick" and "Sancho Weller." His own Colonel Newcome reveals a family likeness, that is unmistakable, to the simple-hearted knight. George Meredith said of Cervantes' characters: "They have in them more *blood-life* than can be found out of Shakspeare." And Sainte-Beuve, perhaps the best equipped and most *judicial minded* of modern critics, has declared: "This story, written for a passing occasion, became the book of humanity."

Despite, then, its many and glaring defects—for *Don Quixote* is, without question, the most carelessly executed of all great books—it has been given its place among the "classics," by the verdict of humanity. When we come, now, to inquire what single excellence, above all others, has obtained for it this verdict, I think we may safely answer, in one word, its *humor*. More even than its catholicity—its universality of appeal; more even than its strong nationalism—its raciness of the Spanish soil—and its vividness of character portrayal; more even than its intensely human quality—is it not, after all, the *salt of humor*, freely and deftly employed—that has proved the great preservative? "It is," I believe, "the varied humor of *Don Quixote*, ranging from broad farce to comedy as subtle as Shakspeare's or Molière's, that has naturalized it in every country where there are readers, and made it a classic in every language that has a literature."

I take pleasure in closing with the witty observations of a recent critic, who fortifies me in my own poor opinion and, besides, being an Englishman, voices it more fearlessly than I should, perhaps, dare to do. "We are sometimes told that 'classics' have had their day, and that the literature of the future means to shake itself loose from the past, and respect no antiquity and recognize no precedent. Will the coming iconoclasts spare *Don Quixote*, or is Cervantes doomed, with Homer and Dante, Shakspeare and Molière? So far as a forecast is

possible, it seems clear that their humor will not be his humor. Even now, persons who take their idea of humor from that form of it most commonly found between yellow and red boards on a railway bookstall, may be sometimes heard to express a doubt about the humor of *Don Quixote*, and the sincerity of those who profess to enjoy it, they themselves being, in their own phrase, unable to see any fun in it. The humor of *Don Quixote* has, however, the advantage of being based upon human nature, and as the human nature of the future will probably be, upon the whole, much the same as the human nature of the past; it is, perhaps, no unreasonable supposition that, what has been relished for its truth, may continue to find some measure of acceptance.

"If it be not presumptuous to express any solicitude about the future, let us hope so; for, it must be owned, its prophets do not encourage the idea that liveliness will be among its characteristics. The humor of Cervantes may have its uses, too, even in that advanced state of society. The future, doubtless, will be great and good and wise and virtuous; but, being still *human*, it will have its vanities and self-conceits, its shams, humbugs, and impostures, even as we have, or haply greater than ours; for every thing, we are told, will be on a scale of which we have no conception; and against these there is no weapon so effective as the old-fashioned one, with which Cervantes smote the great sham of his own day."

LANCASTER, PA.

VII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS IN THE FREER COLLECTION. PART II. THE WASHINGTON MANUSCRIPT OF THE EPISTLES OF PAUL. By Henry A. Sanders, University of Michigan. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price \$1.25.

This is the second volume on the Washington Manuscript published by Professor Sanders, the other being on the Four Gospels. There is first of all a very interesting photograph of the appearance of this part of the Manuscript, when it was found. Then we find the following description: "The fragment was in an almost hopelessly decayed condition when found. No value was put upon it either by the dealer or by Mr. Freer in the purchase of the collection. Neither was the content of the fragment known to either of the parties, and it was preserved and sold with the three large MSS. rather because of its association than from any supposed value of its own. It was, however, thought that some words would prove legible on each of the pages, if the leaves could be separated without too much mutilation." And just this is what has been found, and herein lies the value of the fragment.

Professor Sanders gives us a few other facts about the MSS. and what has been done with it. "It was a blackened, decayed lump of parchment as hard and brittle on the exterior as glue. . . . After a little experimenting it was found that the leaves could be lifted off one at a time, while the top surface was drying after a slight and uniform application of moisture. A thin-bladed dinner knife was used to separate the leaves. The end of the MS. was better preserved, so the separation was begun from that side and was continued as long as any legible writing appeared on the fragmentary leaves removed from the mass. The unseparated portion remaining, though nearly one-half inch thick, is so narrow as to cover hardly more than the unwritten upper margin of the MS. There was little hope of recovering any legible portion, and so it seemed best to preserve this small sample as illustrative of the original condition and appearance of the MS. Though careful search was made for anything bearing on the earlier history of the MS., nothing definite was found."

The book before us is of value mainly to the textual critic, It is too early to say just what value the MS. may have for recovering the true reading of any passages. In the nature of the case it cannot be very great; for there is scarcely a complete sentence in the entire MS. It may help in determining a word here and there.

But even as it is, New Testament scholars owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Sanders for the labor which he has bestowed on deciphering the MS. and on editing it for this publication.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS AND THE BOOK OF ACTS. By D. A. Hayes. The Methodist Book Concern, New York and Cincinnati. Price \$2.00 net.

This belongs to the Biblical Introduction Series, to which the same author has already contributed two volumes, one on Paul and his Epistles, and the other on John and His Writings. Like its predecessors, this volume is in many respects an admirable book. No one can read it without being better prepared to understand The Synoptic Gospels and Acts. The book is throughout interesting and full of information. The author has gathered a great deal of biographical material on the several authors of the books treated. Indeed, this is one of the characteristics of the volume. Seldom does one find so much interesting and valuable information on this particular aspect of Introduction.

The position of the author is conservative. He does not hesitate to affirm that the several books are to be ascribed to the men whom tradition has named. He gives very little time to a consideration of the arguments, which make for an opposite conclusion. This is well illustrated by what he says of the authorship of our first Gospel. He says, "All in ancient times agreed that the author was Matthew, and all modern efforts to disprove the unanimous testimony of antiquity have fallen far short of conclusiveness;" and then he goes on at once to assume that the matter is settled, without so much as stating what has been said or what may be said on the other side. One can hardly help wondering whether he has given sufficient consideration to the subject, or whether he is swayed entirely by preconceived ideas.

The author evidently has a vivid imagination; and occasionally he uses it rather freely in reconstructing his history. This is illustrated by the following bit of reasoning. The Latin word *marcus* may mean a heavy hammer. There is a tradition that the author of the second Gospel was "stump-fingered." Hence the conclusion that John, who was also called Mark, had in early life mashed the fingers of his left hand with a hammer, and was afterwards called Mark! This, of course, is interesting; but it is scarcely history; and the pity of it is that the author does not tell his readers that he is romancing.

In spite of a few defects like these, we do not hesitate to recommend the book to all earnest readers of the New Testament. It is perhaps better adapted for the general reader than for the scientific student; but no one can read the book without deriving both pleasure and profit from it. Its style is always clear, and the

presentation of its several themes excellent. It is a real contribution to our literature on the subject.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.

THE APOCALYPSE OF JOHN, STUDIES IN INTRODUCTION WITH A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY. By Isbion T. Beckwith, Ph.D., D.D., formerly Professor of the Interpretation of the New Testament in the General Theological Seminary, New York, and of Greek in Trinity College, Hartford. The Macmillan Company, New York. Price \$4.00.

We have here an excellent commentary on one of the most difficult books of the New Testament. There is evidence on almost every page that the author has brought ample scholarship to the task which he has undertaken. The commentary is intended primarily for the technical student; and it is well calculated to meet his needs. The comments are, of course, based on the Greek original; and the Greek text is freely quoted. But the author has been careful to translate every quotation from a foreign language, so that any one, whether he knows Greek or not, may profitably use the book. For this the author is to be commended; for it places these excellent studies within the reach of every intelligent reader of the New Testament. It is to be hoped that the book may find such a wider circle of readers; for, if a book like this could be read generally, there would be fewer persons led astray by the vagaries of premillennarianism.

As the author says, "For the understanding of the Revelation of John it is essential to put oneself, as far as possible, into the world of the author and of those to whom it was first addressed. Its meaning must be sought for in the light thrown upon it by the condition and the circumstances of its readers, by the author's inspired purpose, and by the current beliefs and traditions that not only influenced the fashion which his visions themselves took, but also and especially determined the form of this literary composition in which he was given a record of his visions." Hence the author has been at great pains to give a full treatment of all such topics as may be necessary for the reader to put himself into the right attitude for the proper understanding of the book of Revelation itself. It is safe to say that a great many of the misunderstandings of the book grow out of just this fact that ordinary readers do not have this equipment.

The volume before us is hence to be commended first of all for the ample introduction by which the commentary itself is preceded. The author has given four hundred and sixteen pages to these introductory studies. Of course, it is not necessary for every reader to read the whole of these pages in order to appreciate the commentary. Many of them are for the technical student. But there are many topics treated, about which every reader of the Revelation must know something, if he hopes to understand the book.

Among these introductory studies, which every reader will find helpful, are valuable essays on The Eschatological Hope, Apocalyptic Literature, The Times of the Apocalypse of John, The Purpose, Question of Unity, Some Characteristics of the Author's Literary Manner, Summary of the Contents of the Apocalypse, Permanent and Transitory Elements in the Apocalypse, etc. A careful reading of these chapters will put the reader into a position where he will be prepared to understand the Apocalypse as he could not well be otherwise.

The commentary itself, though often brief, is excellent. Often there are notes in fine print, which are intended for the technical student, and which the ordinary reader, who reads the book for edification, may pass by. Every section of the book is preceded by a brief introduction, which often throws a flood of light on what follows. The comments on words and phrases are generally clear and helpful.

We recommend the volume to all earnest students of the New Testament, who may be interested in this fascinating but often misunderstood book of Revelation. Especially do we commend it to all young ministers who may be disturbed by the prevailing premillennarianism. There is no better cure for that heresy than a careful study of the book of Revelation by the historical method, in the light of the literary method of the apocalyptic writers, and of the conditions by which the writer and the first readers of the book were surrounded.

WILLIAM C. SCHAEFFER.

THE CONFESSIONS OF A BROWNING LOVER. By John Walker Powell. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pages 240. Price \$1.00.

This is a bright, wholesome, stimulative book. In it the author makes full confession of the faith that is in him, justifying it with arguments so cogent and eloquence so winning that one is persuaded, whether one will or no, to be numbered also among the Browning Lovers.

It is not with Browning as philosopher or theologian that Dr. Powell concerns himself, but with Browning the artist. For this reason his work is original, fresh, and suggestive. In his Preface he renounces the tiresome office of commentator and formally disavows any intent or purpose "to discover the meaning of puzzling passages or to elucidate obscure references," wisely leaving these things to "Browning Societies and learned librarians' assistants, who delight in them."

The chapter headings will sufficiently indicate the line of treatment: "Of the Poet as Artist;" "Of Artists and Philosophers;" "Of Ideas and Forms;" "Of Orthodoxy and the Theory of Knowledge;" "Of Structural *vs.* Ornamental Truth;" "Of Life and

Love;" "Of the Problem of Evil;" "Prospice (A Vision of Immortality). A few citations will indicate the author's viewpoint and encourage others, I hope, to follow, with an open mind, his interpretation of the poet's larger meaning.

In Chapter I he declares: "There doubtless is such a thing as didactic poetry; but in the main the adjective and the noun destroy each other. . . . It is as an artist, therefore, that I find my enjoyment in the poet; an artist with a serious purpose withal, whose message is embedded in his art." In Chapter II we are told: "The artistic spirit has always been distrusted by the moralists, from Plato to Tolstoy. . . . That Saul, the son of a highly respectable middle-class father of considerable means, should be found among the prophets, has always been considered rather a disgrace. . . . Subtle he (Browning) is, and fond of dissertation; but at such times he is by so much less an artist. . . . The moral interest is the deepest thing in life; but it is not the whole of life, and more than the foundation is the whole of the house. This is the great gulf fixed between the artist and the reformer. If the artist has sinned through the dilettante spirit, through the failure to take life seriously, the reformer has been no less sadly mistaken in not recognizing the wholesome character of normal human interests and in not waiting until he understood his neighbor before proceeding to the work of uplift."

In later chapters the poet's definite message is discussed: "Browning starts with the conviction that life is worth while. Whether the conviction had its roots primarily in the poet's heart or his head is a question that need not detain us. At any rate, finding men lovable and interesting, he finds it easy to accept the philosophy upon which alone such loving interest in mankind can rest. . . . The significant thing is that the poet saw in the story of One whose love was the visible expression of the Love of God, and in whose death God somehow entered into the experience of human woe and sorrow, the most powerful and vital religious conception that ever entered into the heart of man. And founding his whole religious philosophy on the conviction that anything which answers a fundamental human need must be essentially true, he thus became a bulwark of spiritual faith against the assaults of modern impersonalism."

And here, finally, is a message for the times, which may, peradventure, reach a few willing ears and sink into as many receptive hearts: "To the intense social consciousness of the present age it seems almost incomprehensible that a poet with Browning's all-embracing human sympathies should have seemed so entirely unconscious of social problems. . . . But Browning was both by temperament and philosophy an individualist. The outward conditions of life seemed to him but 'A stuff to try the soul's strength

on, educate the man.' He realized what reformers are continually forgetting, that society is made up of folks, and that all social progress rests, in the last analysis, on the development of individual character. The chief obstacles in its path are not bad laws and imperfect social machinery so much as bad men and imperfect human character. . . . Political bossism, the mad trust, unreasonable restraint of trade, all are the fruit of greed and lack of common honesty. It is the capitalist who is unwilling to pay a fair wage and the laborer who is not worthy of his hire who together create the labor problem. It is selfishness which breaks up homes. It is self-indulgence which gives rise to the problems of vice and intemperance. . . . The problem of character is the root-problem of social progress."

C. ERNEST WAGNER.

THE PEACEFUL LIFE: A STUDY IN SPIRITUAL HYGIENE. By Oscar Kuhns. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pages 234. Price \$1.00.

In this book Prof. Kuhns, for many years a teacher in Wesleyan University, speaks out of the fullness of his heart. In a frank, engaging way, he tells the story of his own peaceful life, with its temperamental, intellectual, and spiritual foundations, and its charmingly tranquil details. The story is abundantly and happily adorned with quotations from authors ancient and modern, sacred and profane, Greek, Latin, Italian, French, German, British, and American. The seven chapters discuss: "What Constitutes a Peaceful Life;" "Some Hindrances;" "Bodily, Mental, and Spiritual Hygiene;" "Some Intellectual Aids to the Peaceful Life;" "Nature as an Aid to a Life of Peace;" "The Peace-Giving Power of Religion;" "The Rewards of a Peaceful Life."

There are many wise and helpful thoughts in the book, a few of which I cannot forbear quoting: "The spiritual things we seek for do not make us discontented, envious, or proud; for all men can have them. The more we have ourselves and the more we give to others, the more there is in the world; for here 'giving doth not impoverish nor withholding enrich.'" Again: "Never has there been a time when the cultivation of this form of soul-hygiene" (the power to enjoy solitude) "is more needed than at the present, when the whole world is nothing but a great buzzing confusion, 'full of sound and fury, signifying nothing;' when, in the words of Emerson, all society seems to be in conspiracy against the welfare of each one of its members." And so, today more than ever, the man who desires to attain to a state of peace must learn to retire into the quiet precincts of his own soul from time to time, there to gather strength to meet the trials and conflicts of life." And again: "We believe the times are ripe for a new interpretation of that religion which is 'sense and taste for the Infinite,

and as essentially a part of human nature as either knowledge or action'; and we believe the time will soon come when both phases of the teaching of Christ which answer to the psychology of religious experience in man may be more completely realized than ever before. Then, indeed, the church will be, not only the center for social and philanthropic service, but likewise a place of refuge and quiet rest from the storms of time, the 'large upper chamber, whose windows look out on the rising of the sun, and the name of that chamber is Peace.'"

Prof. Kuhns' little book, apart from its timely, much-needed message, should have a special interest for members of our Reformed communion, because of a fact, thus simply told: "My father, too, was deeply religious, by nature and heredity. (He was of German-Swiss descent.) He was born in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and was baptized and confirmed in the First Reformed Church of that city, founded by his ancestors early in the eighteenth century. He was deeply religious from his earliest youth, and earnestly desired to become a minister of the gospel. The church decided to send one of its young men to college for that purpose, and the choice lay between my father and another young man named Evans. The latter was chosen, went to college, but on graduation decided he did not want to be a minister, and studied dentistry. This was the famous Dr. Thomas Evans, who became the leading dentist of Paris, and at the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war assisted the Empress Eugénie in her flight from Paris."

Amid the turmoil of these troublous times, a book like this is a veritable blessing, for which one should be devoutly thankful. That any man should be able now to possess his soul in peace, is a triumph worthy, indeed, of emulation.

C. ERNEST WAGNER.

THE SPIRITUAL MEANING OF "IN MEMORIAM": AN INTERPRETATION FOR THE TIMES. By James Main Dixon. The Abingdon Press, New York. Pages 170. Price \$1.00.

What purports to be an "Interpretation for the Times" of the "Spiritual Meaning of 'In Memoriam'" proves, on reading, to be an anti-German screed, sustained through thirty-two burning chapters. If Lord Tennyson's noble poem were a veritable "Hymn of Hate," it could hardly serve the author's purpose better.

Lines like these, for example:

"Let knowledge grow from more to more,
But more of reverence in us dwell,"

are "interpreted" for us as follows: "In this passage the poet seems to foresee the advent of a brutal power, depending fatuously

on its mental and physical endowments, and endeavoring to lay the whole world prostrate."

All Teuton philosophers, scientists, and reformers (including Luther) are anathema, and Goethe is portrayed, in Chapter XXIII, as "The High Priest of German *Kultur*." "When traveling in Italy," we are told, "it was with pagan Italy only that he (Goethe) showed sympathy. Coming to the church of the saintly Francis at Assisi, 'I passed it by,' he remarks, 'in disgust.' Dante's '*Inferno*' he thought abominable, and the '*Paradiso*' tiresome." And what is our author's "interpretation" here? It follows hard upon. "No wonder the sympathies of Italy, in this world crisis, turned away from the land which has made an idol of Goethe."

The debased morality of Prussian state policy is traced, back of Frederick the Great's time, to Martin Luther, who—himself the heir of Machiavelli—"accepted a theory of unlimited state sovereignty which divorced political ethics from personal ethics." By way of effective contrast, "The Frenchman, John Calvin," is proclaimed "the great religious political thinker of the ages, as Plato is the great metaphysician." Uniting, as he did, "a profound political instinct with a fervid religious faith almost unexampled in history, he was preëminently the theologian of the Reformation, and may be said to have saved it as a movement."

Incidentally, the book is also a strong Calvinistic pamphlet. "The great apostle of Calvinistic evangelicalism (in England), Charles Simeon," is credited with a surprising thing: "People to-day wonder why India has kept so loyal to the British flag; I would answer, largely from the influence of the devout men sent out from Cambridge University during the pastorate of Simeon." And, furthermore, we are assured that "by the wonderful Providence it is to an American born in a Calvinistic manse that the destinies of the whole world today seem in a large measure intrusted."

Ardent Calvinism, however, is by no means Cambridge's sole title to distinction, or the one secret of her far-reaching influence. At the close of Chapter VII, after commenting on the discovery, by Johann Gottfried Gable, of the planet Neptune, on the night of September 16, 1846, in the Sternwarte, at Berlin, the author declares: "Notwithstanding the scientific activities of the German universities before the war, Cambridge has never ceased to be, in a large and high sense, the world home of science proper."

But we have said more than enough to give any prospective reader an idea of what to expect in this book. Tennyson's "In Memoriam" (to return to our supposed subject) is presented, in the opening chapter, as "practically the best antidote we have to the dangerous and poisonous teaching of Goethe, Nietzsche,

Treitschke, and the whole modern school of German thinkers." If any such "antidote" is needed, at this time of day, surely a more specific virus may be found in Mr. Dixon's own zealous "Interpretation."

C. ERNEST WAGNER.

WITHOUT THE WALLS: A READING PLAY. By Katrina Trask. The Macmillan Company, New York. Pages 196. Price \$1.40.

Mrs. Trask's new play tells the love story of a Jewish maiden and a Roman soldier, in Jerusalem, in the year of the Crucifixion, A. D. 33. It is in three Acts, and may be read easily at a single sitting.

The principal characters are a rich Pharisee, his beautiful daughter, Alceda, a middle-aged Jewish suitor (the father's choice), and the accepted lover, Tiberius, a noble and high-spirited centurion. As befits a well-ordered drama, the course of true love is not permitted to run smooth; but in the end Love is triumphant, and the happy pair finish in each other's arms.

In a series of vivid sketches, our Lord's last days on earth are movingly portrayed. The Third Act contains a remarkable scene. It is the very hour of the Crucifixion. On a green hill, without the walls and not far from Golgotha, are seated Tiberius, Nicodemus—a Ruler in Israel, Antiochus—a Greek philosopher, and Marius—a young Roman courtier. Interested in the great event, but unwilling to mingle with the mob that swarms around the further slope, they await the messages which a servant of Tiberius brings them from time to time. Thus seated, they hear, in turn, the last sayings of Jesus, uttered upon the Cross, and comment thereon, each in a way characteristic of the speaker's temper, training, and racial prejudices. The situation is effective and well wrought out, and, of itself, rewards one for reading the play.

C. ERNEST WAGNER.

REBUILDING EUROPE. By Newell Dwight Hillis, D.D. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 1920. Pages 256. Price \$1.50.

Few men in this country are better informed concerning world-movements than Dr. Hillis. Himself a student, Dr. Hillis possesses many outside aids such as the average minister or teacher does not and cannot have. Through his extensive travels, his church secretaries and helpers, and his multitude of friends in many lands and professions, he is perhaps better situated to be widely informed than any man in America. In his new book the prominent Brooklyn pastor gives us information without which the modern minister can scarcely be conscious of the magnitude of our reconstruction task. Even the student who keeps pretty well informed concerning the world's present life will here find an "eye-

opener." His volume is chuck-full of vital homiletical material. Much of this material is now used in Dr. Hillis' famous "Better America" series of lectures for which there has been so great a demand throughout the entire United States.

There are eight chapters in the book, each of which summarizes the essential facts concerning the country discussed. Chapter I deals with: "Germany; Her Human Losses and the Reflex Influence of the War Upon Her People." Chapter II discusses: "France; The Rebuilding of Her People." Thus, in order, "Great Britain," "Russia," "The Little Nations of the East" and the "United States" are considered. The facts concerning the organized effort to propagate radicalism in the United States are alone worth far more than the price of the book. No other volume would make a better foundation for a series of sermons such as would prove valuable in stimulating a love for America and a return to the faith of our Fathers

H. D. McKEEHAN.

SOCIETAL EVOLUTION. By Albert Galloway Keller, Professor of the Science of Society, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. The Macmillan Company, New York. 1916.

Here we have a real book. It is the ripe product of a clear sociological thinker. Despairing of what is commonly termed "evolution," this man goes back and restudies Darwin, Spencer and Huxley. The author then undertakes a great task, the outcome of which is indeed pleasing. Starting with a modified form (modified in the sense of being modern) of the Darwinian theory of organic evolution, Professor Keller, endeavors to transfer the theory directly to society and the development of society. In other words he tries to give to the student of society the same concrete data as are possessed by the student of nature. The book falls well into six divisions: (1) The Evolution of The Human Type; (2) Variations; (3) Selection: (A) Automatic; and (B) Rational; (4) Counter Selection; (5) Transmission; and (6) Adaptation.

Of course, this is not a "book of sermons." It is more than this. As a student of society the preacher has here a working theory by which he can better understand social customs, usages and traditions. Moreover, it will help him to better understand any social-science study, and to approach more rationally any concrete social problem. A thoughtful reading of this book will quite likely tend to influence the theology of the reader. The man who sees divinity in humanity will likely be interested in the long road up which the human race has climbed. The book abounds in choice illustrations which tend to throw much light upon social practices, customs and traditions. This volume will assist anyone to a better understanding of both society and religion.

H. D. McKEEHAN.

PROPOSED ROADS TO FREEDOM. By Bertrand Russell, F.R.S. Henry Holt and Company, New York. 1919. Pages 212. Price \$1.50.

In this age we all hear much and know something about Anarchism, Socialism and Syndicalism. Each and all of these terms are often used promiscuously to designate any radical change in present governmental systems. It is almost universally acknowledged that the author of proposed Roads to Freedom, is a brilliant star among the greatest of present-day thinkers, none perhaps can carry out a more critical analysis. Neither, again, can any construct a more rational program. No one with eyes and ears can doubt the reality of a social spirit of dissatisfaction and unrest. Yet wherein is the panacea? We are well agreed that neither the orthodox standpatter nor the unscrupulous radical can or dare succeed. We are, indeed, all looking for a "road to freedom," though no one seems to know just what proposed road to take. Hence, no more timely volume could now appear than this one from the pen of England's Prince of Thinkers.

In his preface the author states the plan and purpose of the book when he says: "These doctrines (Socialism, Anarchy and Syndicalism) are considered first historically, then critically, and it is urged—that . . . all have something to contribute to the picture of the future society which we should wish to create." In other words, by careful analysis—trying each at the bar of pure reason—he picks out the self-evident virtues of each theory of government. Thus, having extracted the gold from the dross, he groups the virtues of all into his last illuminating chapter, which he calls: "The World As It Could Be Made." This chapter, in the mind of the reviewer, is the most logical and plausible "road to freedom" thus far proposed by any so-called radical. At least no book so sane has been forthcoming since the war. The author's discussion of international peace and of social happiness should be read and pondered by every minister and by every thoughtful layman.

If we may add a negative criticism, it can be well said that Mr. Russell, while upholding the ideal of the religion of the New Testament, fails to consider the social value of Christianity and is blind to the supreme force for peace such as we have in the Gospel of Jesus. He is a great prophet but his voice is limited almost wholly to the economic side of life.

H. D. McKEEHAN.